U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service

PB-286 279

Instream Flow Strategies for New Mexico

(U.S.) Enviro Control, Inc, Fort Collins, CO

Prepared for

Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Collins, CO Western Energy and Land Use Team

May 78

Biological Services Program

PB 286 279

FWS/OBS-78/41
MAY 1978

INSTREAM FLOW STRATEGIES FOR NEW MEXICO

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

Interagency Energy-Environment Research and Development Program
Office of Research and Development • U. S. Environmental Protection Agency

Fish and Wildlife Service

U.S. Department of the Interior

94

The Biological Services Program was established within the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to supply scientific information and methodologies on key environmental issues which have an impact fish and wildlife resources and their supporting ecosystems. The mission of the Program is as follows:

1. To strengthen the Fish and Wildlife Service in its role as a primary source of information on natural fish and wildlife resources, particularly with respect to environmental impact assessment.
2. To gather, analyze, and present information that will aid decisionmakers in the identification and resolution of problems associated with major land and water use changes.
3. To provide better ecological information and evaluation for Department of the Interior development programs, such as those relating to energy development.

Information developed by the Biological Services Program is intended for use in the planning and decisionmaking process, to prevent or minimize the impact of development on fish and wildlife. Biological Services research activities and technical assistance services are based on an analysis of the issues, the decisionmakers involved and their information needs, and an evaluation of the state-of-the-art to identify information gaps and determine priorities. This is a strategy to assure that the products produced and disseminated will be timely and useful.

Biological Services projects have been initiated in the following areas:

Coal extraction and conversion

Power plants

Geothermal, mineral, and oil shale development

Water resource analysis, including stream alterations and western water allocation

Coastal ecosystems and Outer Continental Shelf development.

Systems and inventory, including National Wetlands Inventory, habitat classification and analysis, and information transfer

The Program consists of the Office of Biological Services in Washington, D.C., which is responsible for overall planning and management; National Teams which provide the Program's central, scientific and technical expertise, and which arrange for contracting of Biological Services studies with States, universities, consulting firms, and others; Regional staff who provide a link to problems at the operating level; and staff at certain Fish and Wildlife Service research facilities who conduct inhouse research studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

1. Report No.
FWS/OBS-78/41

2.

3. Recipient's Accession No.
PB286279

4. Title and Subtitle
Instream Flow Strategies for New Mexico

5. Report Date
May 1978

6.

7. Author(s)
Wayne Nelson, Gerry Horak and Joe Solomon

8. Performing Organization Rept. No.

9. Performing Organization Name and Address
Enviro Control, Inc.
1520 East Mulberry Street, Fort Collins, CO 80524
and
11300 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852

10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.
WELUT No. 023

11. Contract/Grant No.
14-16-0008-2121

12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address
Western Energy and Land Use Team, Office of Biological Services
Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior
Drake Creekside Building, 2625 Redwing Road
Fort Collins, CO 80526

13. Type of Report & Period Covered
Final

14.

15. Supplementary Notes
Western Water Allocation; EPA

16. Abstracts
This is one of 13 reports that identifies and evaluates the most promising institutional methods for reserving instream flows to benefit fish and wildlife in each of 13 western states. The states included in the study are Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington and Wyoming. Each report has three main sections. First is a guide to help the reader select the most important strategy for any given situation, followed by a summary evaluation of how well the method has worked in the state. The third part is a detailed narrative description of the procedures for implementing the strategy and an example of how it has been employed in the state.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors
Instream flow
Instream flow methodology
Instream flow criteria

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms
Western United States

17c. COSATI Field/Group

18. Availability Statement
Release unlimited

19. Security Class (This Report)
UNCLASSIFIED

20. Security Class (This Page)
UNCLASSIFIED

21. No. of Pages
94

22. Price
MFA01
PCA05

FORM NTIS-35 (REV. 10-73) ENDORSED BY ANSI AND UNESCO. THIS FORM MAY BE REPRODUCED USCOMM-DC 8265-P74

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1978 - 777-138/3112 Reg. 8

FWS/OBS-78/41
May 1978

INSTREAM FLOW STRATEGIES FOR NEW MEXICO

By

Wayne Nelson, Gerry Horak and Joe Solomon

Enviro Control, Inc.
1520 East Mulberry Street
Fort Collins, Colorado 80524

and

11300 Rockville Pike
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Contract No. 14-16-0008-2121
Western Water Allocation Project

Harvey Doerksen, Project Officer
Western Energy and Land Use Team
Drake Creekside Building
2625 Redwing Road
Fort Collins, Colorado 80526

Performed for

Western Energy and Land Use Team
Office of Biological Services
Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

DISCLAIMER

The opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this report/product are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Office of Biological Services, Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use by the Federal Government.

PREFACE

This report represents the combined efforts of several individuals and firms toward a common objective: the identification, description and preliminary evaluation of the most promising strategies (institutional methods) for reserving instream flows for fish and wildlife under existing laws.

Toward this objective, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, through its Western Water Allocation Project, contracted with two firms. Richard Dewsnup and Dallin Jensen received a contract to identify available strategies under state laws, federal laws, interstate compacts, and water quality laws. From a large number of strategies identified by this contract effort, the most promising ones were selected for further evaluation. A second firm, Enviro Control, Inc., was contracted to evaluate the most promising strategies in depth.

The combined efforts of the two firms were published in several reports which are identified below. Following this initial effort, a separate report for each state was published. This was done in the belief that most persons who are involved in instream flow work are primarily oriented to a single state. The several western states are at different levels in terms of their laws supporting instream flows, their water rights traditions, and their past experiences regarding the reservation of instream flows for fish and wildlife. This is one of the individual state reports.

The report is organized into three sections. These are the information matrix, the evalation matrix, and the narrative description of each strategy. The information matrix is intended to be a guide to help the reader select the strategy or stategies most applicable to any particular situation. This matrix contains a general description of the strategy, the most applicable situations for its use, the party or parties who can initiate the strategy, and the party or parties who must implement the strategy.

The evaluation matrix provides a subjective analysis of whether each strategy has been used to advantage, disadvantage, or not at all in each state. A unique feature of the evaluation matrix is that a blank matrix is provided for the reader. This is done because an evaluation of this kind is necessarily a product of a given time frame and a particular point of view. The blank evaluation matrix will allow the reader to evaluate the strategies as times, laws, experiences, and traditions change in the state.

The narrative section of the report contains an expanded description of each strategy, notes its application possibilities, illustrates the usage of the strategy within the state, and evaluates its general utility. All of the narrative materials are oriented to the particular state for which the report is written.

In the use of this report, the reader should be aware of its purposes and limitations. First, only a few of the many possible strategies are described herein. The user should exercise initiative, judgement, and creativity in dealing with any specific situation. Second, this report should be used as a starting point. In any situation related to the acquisition of instream water rights, legal advice should be sought. This report should in no way be construed as a substitute for the opinion of a private attorney, attorney general, or agency solicitor. Third, this report is neither a policy nor decision document. It is simply a collection of strategies which appear to have utility in a variety of situations.

Further questions about these and other strategies may be addressed to the Cooperative Instream Flow Service Group, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Western Energy and Land Use Team, Drake Creekside Building, 2625 Redwing Road, Fort Collins, Colorado 80526. This Group is an interagency, intergovernmental, interdisciplinary service organization under sponsorship of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Western Energy and Land Use Team. The Group provides a focal point for the increasing activity of instream flow assessments.

For more detail on the strategies, the user of this report should be aware of supportive documentation contained in several related reports:

1. FWS/OBS-77/26. Strategies for Reserving Flows for Fish and Wildlife: Identifcation, Description and Preliminary Evaluation. By Richard L. Dewsnup and Dallin W. Jensen, February 1977. 706 pages.

   This is the full completion report prepared by Dewsnup and Jensen under the FWS contract. It contains chapters on regulatory authority and property rights in water resources, strategies for reserving instream flows under Federal statutes, strategies for protecting instream flows under State statutes, and interstate compacts as they relate to the protection of instream flows. This report is only available from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS Accession No. PB 276 243).

2. FWS/OBS-77/27. State Laws and Instream Flows. By Richard L. Dewsnup and Dallin W. Jensen, March 1977. 76 pages.

   This report is a slightly modified version of the State law chapter taken from the above report. It contains a summary matrix in which the legal basis (e.g., statute in the State code) for each strategy in each State will be identified. This report is also available from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS Accession No. PB 272974).

3. FWS/OBS-77/29. Promising Strategies for Reserving Instream Flows. By Richard L. Dewsnup and Dallin W. Jensen, Edward Hoban, Gerald Horak, Martin Lewis, and Wayne Nelson, August 1977. 63 pages.

This report contains descriptions of 26 strategies for reserving instream flows under existing laws. The descriptions provide guidance on the level of action required, legal bases for each strategy, and advantages, disadvantages, and costs involved in strategy implementation. This report is also available from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS Accession No. PB 276 046).

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BR	Bureau of Reclamation
CE	Corps of Engineers
DOE	Department of Energy
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FWS	Fish and Wildlife Service
FS	Forest Service
HCRS	Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service
SCS	Soil Conservation Service

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE iii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS vi

INFORMATION MATRIX 1
    Information Matrix for New Mexico 2

EVALUATION MATRIX 9
    Evaluation Matrix for New Mexico 10

APPROPRIATIVE WATER RIGHTS 12
    State Condemnation and Reallocation of Water Rights 13
    State Appropriation of Instream Flow 14
    State Moratoria on New Appropriations 15
    State Discretionary Water Permit Authority 16

LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS 18
    Federal Reauthorization of Projects 19
    State-Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers System 23
    State Definition of Navigable Waters 28
    State-Federal Interagency Consultations 29
    Federal License and Permit Stipulations 35
    State Allocation of Reservoir Space 40
    State Purchase and Lease of Water Rights 41

WATER RESOURCE PLANNING 44
    Federal Water Resources Council Planning Programs 45
    Federal Aid Funding to Purchase Storage 48
    Federal Reservoir Construction and Enlargement 52

WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT 56
    State Water Rights Records Analyzed 57
    State-Federal Flow Requests Made Early 60
    State-Federal Flow Requests Made Specific 64
    State-Federal Combined Storage and Flow Requests 68

ENGINEERING ALTERNATIVES 72
    Coordinated Multi-Reservoir Operations 73
    Reservoir Sediment Storage Releases 77
    Stream Channels to Convey Stored Water 81

INFORMATION MATRIX

INFORMATION MATRIX

Strategies for Reserving Instream Flows in New Mexico

Title	IDENTIFICATION		APPLICATION				
			Initiation		Implementation		
	General Description	Applicable Situations	Parties	Actions	Parties	Actions	Expenditures
APPROPRIATIVE WATER RIGHTS							
State Condemnation and Reallocation of Water Rights	Not applicable in this State	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
State Appropriation of Instream Flows	Not applicable in this State	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
State Moratoria on New Appropriations	Not applicable in this State	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
State Discretionary Water Permit Authority	Utilizing discretionary opportunities by the permit authority for the benefit of instream flows	Granting new water permits or exchanges or transfers of existing rights	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; public interest groups	Petition New Mexico State Engineer to deny or amend permit application	New Mexico State Engineer	Deny or amend permit application	Bargaining cost; study cost
LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS							
Federal Reauthorization of Projects	Reauthorizing existing Federal water resource projects to provide for instream flow reservations	At existing Federal dams or stream diversions	Construction agency; public interest groups; FWS Area Office, (Phoenix); New Mexico Department of Game and Fish	Lobby to have construction agency conduct feasibility study; seek Congressional reauthorization	U.S. Congress	Enact legislation reauthorizing the project (approved by Committee, passed by both houses)	Feasibility study cost; bargaining cost; legislative cost.

INFORMATION MATRIX

Strategies for Reserving Instream Flows in New Mexico

Title	IDENTIFICATION		APPLICATION				
			Initiation		Implementation		
	General Description	Applicable Situations	Parties	Actions	Parties	Actions	Expenditures
State-Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers System	Designating stream segments for inclusion within a wild and scenic rivers system to promote instream flow reservations	Along free-flowing stream segments, bordered by visually appealing landscape	Local citizens; Member of Congress	Organize and demonstrate local support to convince elected representatives to introduce a Bill	U.S. Congress; Forest Service; Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service; FWS Region 2 Office; New Mexico Department of Game and Fish	Pass a Bill authorizing study of the segment(s); conduct study to inventory resource and solicit local views; after agency review, consider study report in Congressional Committee and pass a Bill approving designation	Study cost; legislative cost
State Definition of Navigable Waters	Not applicable in this State	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
State-Federal Interagency Consultation	Adopting interagency agreements, regulations, and formal procedures to implement the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act toward promoting instream flow reservations	Planning new or expanded Federal water resource projects	FWS Region 2 Office; New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; public interest groups	Seek interagency agreements based on adopted regulations or procedures; promote strengthening procedures or see that they are enforced	FWS Region 2 Office; New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; construction or permit agency	Draw up agreements or make existing procedures more stringent	Bargaining cost

INFORMATION MATRIX

Strategies for Reserving Instream Flows in New Mexico

Title	IDENTIFICATION		APPLICATION				
			Initiation		Implementation		
	General Description	Applicable Situations	Parties	Actions	Parties	Actions	Expenditures
Federal License and Permit Stipulations	Incorporating stipulations in new and renewed Federal licenses and permits to reserve instream flows	Authorizing planned or existing Federal dams and reservoir projects	FWS Area Office (Phoenix); New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; public interest groups; private citizens	Determine quantity of flow required; make specific instream flow recommendation to permit or license agency	Permit or license agency (FERC, BLM, FS etc.)	Stipulate flow reservation in permit or license	Study cost; bargaining cost
State Allocation of Reservqir Space	Not applicable in this State	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
State Purchase and Lease of Water Rights	Obtaining contractual arrangements which include direct purchase of flow rights, the leasing of water rights, and the purchase of shares in a mutual water company to enhance instream flows	Particularly along overappropriated streams	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; private citizens; public interest groups	Identify stream where the purchase of only a few cfs can made a significant difference to the fishery; locate willing seller, lessor, or mutual shares company	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; private citizens; public interest groups	Purchase or lease water right or purchase shares in a mutual shares company	Acquisition cost; negotiation cost

INFORMATION MATRIX

Strategies for Reserving Instream Flows in New Mexico

Title	IDENTIFICATION		APPLICATION				
	General Description	Applicable Situations	Initiation		Implementation		
			Parties	Actions	Parties	Actions	Expenditures
WATER RESOURCE PLANNING							
Federal Water Resources Council Planning Programs	Considering instream flow needs in Water Resources Council planning program toward promoting flow reservations	Planning river basin and energy development	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; FWS Cooperative Instream Flow Group; FWS Region 2 Office; public interest groups	Lobby to have instream flows considered in Level B study or Section 13(a) assessment	New Mexico State Natural Resource and Conservation Commission	Include instream flow requirements in Level B study or Section 13(a) assessment	Study cost
Federal Aid Funding to Purchase Storage	Expending Federal Aid funding to purchase reservoir storage as a means of reserving instream flows	Along overappropriated streams at privately owned reservoirs	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish	Identify stream and reservoir; file required documents requesting funds from Region 2 Federal Aid Office.	FWS Region 2 Federal Aid Office; New Mexico Department of Game and Fish	Grant funds; purchase the water rights	Administrative cost; acquisition cost
Federal Reservoir Construction and Enlargement	Constructing larger new reservoirs or enlarging existing reservoirs to provide for instream flow reservations	At existing or planned Federal reservoirs	FWS Area Office (Phoenix); New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; public interest groups	Conduct stream investigation; recommend a larger dam and reservoir; allocate additional costs to fish and wildlife benefits	Construction agency; U.S. Congress	After possible Congressional authorization, constructs additional storage for instream flows	Study costs; bargaining cost; construction cost; legislative cost

INFORMATION MATRIX

Strategies for Reserving Instream Flows in New Mexico

Title	IDENTIFICATION		APPLICATION				
			Initiation		Implementation		
	General Description	Applicable Situations	Parties	Actions	Parties	Actions	Expenditures
WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT							
State Water Rights Records Analyzed	Analyzing water rights records as an aid to reserving flows	Bargaining for an instream flow	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; FWS Area Office (Phoenix); public interest groups	Determine the extent, location and ownership of water rights from the New Mexico State Engineer	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; FWS Area Office (Phoenix); public interest group	Select the best course of action to reserve an instream flow	Water data cost; study cost
State-Federal Flow Requests Made Early	Presenting recommendations early in the decision process to achieve reservation of instream flows	At planned Federal dams and reservoirs	FWS Area Office (Phoenix); New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; public interest groups	Conduct a timely investigation; recommend an instream flow to the construction agency	Construction agency	Include instream flow in project plans	Study cost; gaging, installation and maintenance cost; bargaining cost
State-Federal Flow Requests Made Specific	Specifying and monitoring instream flow reservations to protect downstream fish and wildlife resources	Along stream reaches below existing or planned Federal dams and reservoirs	FWS Area Office (Phoenix); New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; public interest groups	Conduct detailed instream flow study; recommend flow to the construction and/or permit agency, specifying flow releases and flow quantities required at downstream sites	Construction agency/permit agency	Include flow releases in reservoir's operating criteria; install gaging stations to determine the sufficiency of the actual releases	Study cost; gaging installation and maintenance cost; bargaining cost

INFORMATION MATRIX

Strategies for Reserving Instream Flows in New Mexico

Title	IDENTIFICATION		APPLICATION				
			Initiation		Implementation		
	General Description	Applicable Situations	Parties	Actions	Parties	Actions	Expenditures
State-Federal Combined Storage and Flow Requests	Negotiating for reservoir storage to facilitate instream flow reservations	Planning new reservoirs or reallocating storage space in existing Federal reservoirs	FWS Area Office (Phoenix); New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; public interest groups	Request information regarding reservoir storage allocations and projected sales from the construction agency; determine the amount of storage available to ensure minimum instream flows; recommend storage and flow requirements	Construction agency	Allocate storage to fish and wildlife; include flow releases in the reservoir operating criteria	Bargaining cost; study cost
ENGINEERING ALTERNATIVES							
Coordinated Multi-Reservoir Operations	Coordinating operations of multi-reservoir systems to facilitate instream flow reservations	At Federal dams and reservoirs in multi-reservoir systems	FWS Area Office (Phoenix); New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; FWS Region 2 Office	Conduct systemwide flow study to establish the flows required; propose to alter the operation manual and memorandum of agreement to ensure the recommended flows	Agency or agencies operating the system; U.S. Congress	After possible Congressional reauthorization or relicensing, revise the system operations manual to include instream flows	Study cost; bargaining cost; legislative cost

INFORMATION MATRIX

Strategies for Reserving Instream Flows in New Mexico

Title	IDENTIFICATION		APPLICATION				
			Initiation		Implementation		
	General Description	Applicable Situations	Parties	Actions	Parties	Actions	Expenditures
Reservoir Sediment Storage Releases	Releasing reservoir sediment storage reserves to promote instream flow reservations	At existing Federal dams and reservoirs	FWS Area Office (Phoenix); New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; public interest groups	Determine the quantity of available yield from the sediment reserve; recommend that the construction or administering agency reassign a portion of this yield to benefit fish and wildlife resources	Construction or administering agency	Modify project operation; release yield from the sediment reserve for instream flows	Study cost; bargaining cost
Stream Channels to Convey Stored Water	Conveying stored water to downstream users via the stream channel to aid in securing instream flow reservations	At planned Federal dams and reservoirs	FWS Area Office (Phoenix); New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; public interest groups	Obtain information regarding proposed conveyance systems; determine system's effect on fish and wildlife resources; recommend system modification ot the construction agency	Construction agency	Modify conveyance system to preserve fish and wildlife resources	Study cost; re-design cost; bargaining cost

EVALUATION MATRIX

EVALUATION MATRIX Strategies for Reserving Instream Flows in New Mexico

yes = Advantage ●
no = Disadvantage ○
blank - Inapplicable (in this State) ☐

	ELEMENTS OF EFFECTIVENESS																					ELEMENTS OF COST					
	Overall		Political			Legal					Administrative						Resource					Institutional			Monetary		
	Demonstrated past utility in this State?	Optimism over future effectiveness in this State?	Predominantly involves fish & wildlife interests?	Can be implemented by fish and wildlife interests?	Attracts support from public interest groups?	Clearly established statutory basis?	Avoids legislative or judicial action?	Recognized without legal challenge?	Legally recognizes fish & wildlife values?	Creates legal right to flow reservation?	Available independent of other strategies?	Fits into a funded agency program?	Involves established administrative procedure?	Uses available fish & wildlife agency expertise?	Uses quantified instream flow needs?	Influences early planning & design decisions?	Directly results in flow reservation?	Results in storage for flow augmentation?	Useful during extended low flows?	Useful for overappropriated streams?	Useful with small streams?	Avoids costly legal process?	Avoids costly bargaining process?	Avoids costly planning & design?	Avoids costly reservoir development?	Avoids costly water rights acquisition?	Avoids costly forfeiture of water revenue?
Appropriative Water Rights																											
State Condemnation/Reallocation of Water Rights																											
State Appropriation of Instream Flow																											
State Moratoria on New Appropriations																											
State Discretionary Water Permit Authority	○	○	○	○	●	○	●	○	○	○	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	●	○
Legislative/Administrative Controls																											
Federal Reauthorization of Projects	○	○	●	○	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	○
State-Federal Wild & Scenic River Systems	●	●	●	○	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	●	○	●	○	●	○	○	○	●	●	●
State Definition of Navigable Waters																											
State-Federal Interagency Consultation	○	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	●	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	●	●	●	●
Federal License & Permit Stipulations	○	○	○	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	○
State Allocation of Reservoir Space																											
State Purchase & Lease of Water Rights	○	○	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	○	●	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●
Water Resource Planning																											
Federal WRC Planning Programs	○	●	○	○	○	●	●	●	○	○	●	○	●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	●	●	●
Federal Aid Funding to Purchase Storage	○	○	●	●	○	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●
Federal Reservoir Construction/Enlargement	○	●	●	○	●	●	○	●	○	○	●	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	○	○	○	●	●
Water Resource Management																											
State Water Rights Records Analyzed	○	●	●	●	○	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
State-Federal Flow Requests Made Early	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	●	○	●	○	○	●	●	●
State-Federal Flow Requests Made Specific	○	○	●	○	○	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	●
State-Federal Combined Storage/Flow Requests	○	○	●	○	○	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	○	○	●	●	○
Engineering Alternatives																											
Coordinated Multireservoir Operations	○	○	●	○	●	○	●	●	○	○	●	○	○	○	●	○	●	○	●	●	○	●	○	○	●	●	○
Reservoir Sediment Storage Releases	○	○	●	○	●	○	○	●	○	○	●	○	○	○	●	○	○	●	●	●	○	●	○	●	●	●	○
Stream Channels to Convey Stored Water	●	●	●	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	●

Answers are strictly judgmental, based on written and verbal opinion reported to the Enviro Control study team through December 1977; subject to modification by selected reviewers (empty matrix furnished for reviewers on the following page).

EVALUATION MATRIX Strategies for Reserving Instream Flows in ________

yes = Advantage ●
no = Disadvantage ○
blank - Inapplicable (in this State) ☐

	ELEMENTS OF EFFECTIVENESS																					ELEMENTS OF COST					
	Overall		Political			Legal					Administrative						Resource					Institutional			Monetary		
	Demonstrated past utility in this State?	Optimism over future effectiveness in this State?	Predominantly involves fish & wildlife interests?	Can be implemented by fish and wildlife interests?	Attracts support from public interest groups?	Clearly established statutory basis?	Avoids legislative or judicial action?	Recognized without legal challenge?	Legally recognizes fish & wildlife values?	Creates legal right to flow reservation?	Available independent of other strategies?	Fits into a funded agency program?	Involves established administrative procedure?	Uses available fish & wildlife agency expertise?	Uses quantified instream flow needs?	Influences early planning & design decisions?	Directly results in flow reservation?	Results in storage for flow augmentation?	Useful during extended low flows?	Useful for overappropriated streams?	Useful with small streams?	Avoids costly legal process?	Avoids costly bargaining process?	Avoids costly planning & design?	Avoids costly reservoir development?	Avoids costly water rights acquisition?	Avoids costly forfeiture of water revenue?
Appropriative Water Rights																											
State Condemnation/Reallocation of Water Rights																											
State Appropriation of Instream Flow																											
State Moratoria on New Appropriations																											
State Discretionary Water Permit Authority																											
Legislative/Administrative Controls																											
Federal Reauthorization of Projects																											
State-Federal Wild & Scenic River Systems																											
State Definition of Navigable Waters																											
State-Federal Interagency Consultation																											
Federal License & Permit Stipulations																											
State Allocation of Reservoir Space																											
State Purchase & Lease of Water Rights																											
Water Resource Planning																											
Federal WRC Planning Programs																											
Federal Aid Funding to Purchase Storage																											
Federal Reservoir Construction/Enlargement																											
Water Resource Management																											
State Water Rights Records Analyzed																											
State-Federal Flow Requests Made Early																											
State-Federal Flow Requests Made Specific																											
State-Federal Combined Storage/Flow Requests																											
Engineering Alternatives																											
Coordinated Multireservoir Operations																											
Reservoir Sediment Storage Releases																											
Stream Channels to Convey Stored Water																											

APPROPRIATIVE WATER RIGHTS

STATE CONDEMNATION AND REALLOCATION OF WATER RIGHTS

In New Mexico there are no statutory or administrative provisions for the condemnation of existing water rights to reserve instream flows.

Sources

1. Dewsnup, Richard L., and Dallin W. Jensen, Identification, Description, and Evaluation of Strategies for Reserving Flows for Fish and Wildlife, February 1977.

STATE APPROPRIATION OF INSTREAM FLOW

This strategy is unavailable in New Mexico because of a statutory provision requiring the diversion of stream flow to perfect a valid appropriation.

Sources

1. Dewsnup, Richard L., and Dallin W. Jensen, Identification, Description, and Evaluation of Strategies for Reserving Flows for Fish and Wildlife, February 1977.

STATE MORATORIA ON NEW APPROPRIATIONS

In New Mexico there are no provisions for either statutory or administrative moratoria on new appropriations; thus this strategy is unavailable in New Mexico.

Sources

1. Dewsnup, Richard L., and Dallin W. Jensen, Identification, Description, and Evaluation of Strategies for Reserving Flows for Fish and Wildlife, February 1977.

STATE DISCRETIONARY WATER PERMIT AUTHORITY

I. Identification

There are no explicit New Mexico statutory provisions directing the State Engineer to consider instream flow needs for fish and wildlife when granting water right permits. However, through the powers of the State Engineer's Office and as a matter of the public interest (New Mexico Stat. No. 75-5-6), the State Engineer may deny an application for an appropriation, transfer, or exchange of a water right. If, however, the Engineer finds that the water will be applied, transfered or exchanged to a beneficial use, and that the proposed use will not impair the value of existing rights or is not otherwise detrimental to the public welfare, he must approve the application (New Mexico Stat. No. 75-5-5).

II. Application

This strategy is designed so that fish and wildlife interest petition the State Engineer to recognize instream flow needs on granting permit applications with admininstrative discretion. Although greatly constrained by statutory provisions from implementing this strategy, there still remains opportunities for its application.

As a matter of the public interest, private organizations can petition the State Engineer to deny a permit application or grant a permit for a lesser amount of water than requested by the applicant if it threatens a valuable fishery. Also, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, through its statutory authority to protect and propagate fish and wildlife in the State, can recommend to the State Engineer that administrative discretion be applied. The State Engineer would then deny or amend the application.

III. Illustration

No example could be found where the State Engineer was requested by the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish or a public interest group to use administrative discretion to deny or amend an application for a water permit.

IV. Evaluation

The New Mexico Department of Game and Fish has not utilized this strategy in the past because of the perceived statutory constraints on its use. Theoretically, the State Engineer may exercise administrative discretion in granting water right permits, transfers, or exchanges, although in New Mexico opportunities to utilize this strategy are severely limited by present statutes. According to the State Engineer and the Department of Game and Fish, opportunities for implementing this strategy are further reduced because little water remains unappropriated. Also, without being petitioned by the public, it is unlikely that the State Engineer would deny or make conditional a water permit upon appeal from the Department of Game and Fish.

Sources

1. Dewsnup, Richard L., and Dallin W. Jensen, A Summary-Digest of State Water Laws, 1973.
2. Mutz, Philip, Staff Engineer, New Mexico State Engineer's Office, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.
3. New Mexico Department of Game and Fish Letter to Enviro Control, Inc., 24 February 1978 in response to Enviro Control, Inc., Letter to New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 14 February 1978.
4. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director-Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.

LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

FEDERAL REAUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS

I. Identification

Reauthorization of a Federal water resource project to provide for increased flow releases so as to reserve instream flows involves Congressional passage of legislation modifying the original authorizing legislation. After the sponsoring construction agency conducts feasibility studies, which include comments of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the appropriate Congressional Committee drafts new legislation or amends the original authorizing legislation. The legal basis of this strategy is the Congressional authorization process for water resource projects and construction agency guidelines and procedures for authorizing and modifying water resource projects.

II. Application

This strategy may be pursued when the reauthorization of a water resource project could rehabilitate or markedly improve the downstream fishery. Interest groups of fishermen or conservationists might instigate this strategy; the Fish and Wildlife Service or New Mexico Deparrment of Game and Fish might also. A U.S. Senator or Representative could introduce reauthorizing legislation. Realistically, however, for this strategy to be successful, the construction agency, such as the Bureau of Reclamation or Corps of Engineers, must initiate the process by agreeing to study reauthorization and support it before Congress.

There is a number of important decision points in the formulation and implementation of this strategy. Those encouraging the strategy must decide to lobby the construction agency for action. The construction agency must decide whether to support a study of reauthorization. Once a study is completed, the construction agency may decide to modify the project and, if so, must also decide whether to seek Congressional reauthorization. If the modification is minor, the construction agency has the discretionary authority to alter project operations without Congressional approval. In instances involving instream flows, however, the construction agency would probably seek Congressional approval because of the normally controversial nature of such a modification. To secure the approval of Congress, the construction agency would conduct and submit a feasibility study justifying the proposed change.

Legislation reauthorizing a Bureau of Reclamation project must be approved by the Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and by the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Resources of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Corps of Engineers projects must be approved by the Subcommittee on Water Resources of the House Public Works Committee and by the Subcommittee on Water Resources of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. After reviewing the feasibility report of the construction agency, these committees must decide whether to reauthorize. According to Congressional staff members, as long as there is no significant political opposition, the committees will approve the reauthorizing legislation. The legislation must then be approved by both houses of Congress and signed by the President.

This strategy is costly in terms of money and time. The construction agency and fish and wildlife agencies must fund and conduct a feasibility study to justify the modification and reauthorization of a project already planned and constructed. The reauthorization process takes almost as long -- 5 to 10 years -- as the original authorizing process.

III. Illustration

This strategy has not been applied in New Mexico; therefore, an example from Wyoming will illustrate its utility. Kortes Unit, a component of the Missouri River Basin Project in Wyoming, was reauthorized for fishery conservation in 1971 by the passage of P.L. 92-146. Specifically, the Secretary of the Interior was instructed to maintain a minimum streamflow of 500 cfs in the reach of the North Platte River between Kortes Dam and the normal headwaters of Pathfinder Reservoir. However, when water sufficient to operate the unit in this manner is not available, water must be reserved for hydroelectric power peaking operations, and any remaining water will be released for conservation of the fishery resources.

Before construction and operation of Kortes Unit, the stream reach below the dam site contained an excellent trout fishery. However, once Kortes Unit was built, this resource began to deteriorate. Fish kills would frequently occur due to shut-downs of the Kortes hydroelectric plant. Fishermen and area residents were concerned about the destruction of this valuable fishery. Acting upon this concern, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department convinced the Bureau of Reclamation in 1963 that field studies of various flow regimes should be made. The result of these studies, which were partially funded by the Bureau of Reclamation, was a recommendation to the Bureau that the operation of Kortes power plant be modified to assure a continuous flow of at least 500 cfs between Kortes Dam and Pathfinder Reservoir. In 1964, the Bureau of Reclamation began releasing 500 cfs pending Congressional reauthorization.

In September 1966, the BR completed a special report for the purpose of securing Congressional approval to change the operation of the Kortes Unit from a single-purpose hydroelectric power development to a dual-purpose development with fish and wildlife enhancement as a secondary purpose. The report analyzed the benefits, costs, revenues, and cost allocations with and without the fishery flow. For economic justification, it concluded that the adverse effects at Kortes would be more than offset by the benefits of fishery enhancement. In fact, the benefit-cost ratio increased from 1.31 to 1.36.

In this illustrative situation, important decisions were made by the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department in seeking reauthorization; the Bureau of Reclamation in agreeing to conduct field studies and prepare a report to secure Congressional approval; and the Congressional Committees in supporting the Bureau's position. The fish and game agencies' action was greatly influenced by the valuable fishery at stake while the Bureau's decision was primarily influenced by the great demand for, and little opposition to reauthorization. No economic interest, such as an irrigation district or a municipality, was opposed to reauthorization. The increased benefit-cost ratio from the proposed modification was less important since the project prior to reauthorization was already cost-effective. Although the maintenance of instream flows could result in decreased power production from Kortes Unit, the Bureau of Reclamation could recoup these losses from other hydroelectric projects in the same system. Finally, a positive decision by Congress was assured because of the lack of opposition to reauthorization.

The reauthorization of Kortes Unit took approximately 8 years and incurred substantial cost in time and money among all parties involved. For instance, the Wyoming Game and Fish Department expended between 2 and 3 person-years of effort to conduct its part of the flow studies. These commitments drained some of the limited resources of construction and fish and wildlife agencies. On the positive side, increased flow releases were provided almost immediately after the fish and game agencies completed their study and continued for seven years while project reauthorization was in process. These increased reservoir releases have usually sustained the prescribed minimum flows downstream and restored the downstream fishery.

IV. Evaluation

As shown by the illustration, the strategy of project reauthorization can successfully provide for increased flow releases. For several reasons, however, reauthorization is an unusual occurrence, particularly for fish and wildlife purposes. Once a water resource project is constructed and operating, the fishery interests and the construction agencies have little incentive to incur the expense and time needed to reassess project operations unless a combination of distinctive factors is present. As illustrated by the Kortes Unit reauthorization, the most important factors are the threat to a valuable resource, great demand for project modification, and absence of organized opposition.

Other factors in the successful outcome included increased benefits from reauthorization and the ability to recover the losses caused by changing the use of some water stored. Because this combination of factors is required for the successful implementation of this strategy, both New Mexico Game and Fish and FWS personnel believe it probably will not be applied in New Mexico. Still, if the right combination of factors does occur, this strategy offers two noteworthy advantages. It provides a long-term solution with a firm legal basis. The reauthorizing legislation legally guarantees the necessary flows in perpetuity or until the legislation is again amended.

Sources

1. Brown, Russel, Staff member, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Washington, D.C., Private Communication, June 1977.
2. Chartelain, Donald, Staff member, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Washington, D.C., Private Communication, June 1977.
3. Dexter, W. Donald, Assistant Director, Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Cheyenne, Wyoming, Private Communication, June 1977.
4. Eiserman, Fred, Coordinator, Fisheries Management Division, Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Cheyenne, Wyoming, Private Communication, December 1976.
5. Enviro Control, Inc., Strategies for Reserving Instream Flows for Fish and Wildlife; Task 1(b); Unobligated and Unutilized Reservoir Storage at Federally-Controlled Dams, December 1976.
6. Halterman, Joseph, Biologist, retired, Fish and Wildlife Service, Billings, Montana, Private Communication, December 1976.
7. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director-Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978 .
8. Pacific, Bob, Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.
9. United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation; Cost Allocations Report on the Kortes Unit, Wyoming, September 1966.

STATE-FEDERAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

I. Identification

The addition of a stream segment to the Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers System, which provides for reservation of flows sufficient to accomplish the purposes of the Act, involves administrative and/or legislative action provided by the National Wild and Scenic River Act (P.L. 94-486). Designation as a wild or scenic river has the effect of reserving historical instream flows since new stream diversions and impoundments are prohibited, and may be restricted below or above the designated river segment. If a river is to be managed entirely or partly by a Federal agency, or if it lies wholly or partly within a National Park, Forest, Wildlife Refuge or other Federal land, an act of Congress is required. The Secretary of Interior can grant a Federal designation if the river is part of a state river protection program. New Mexico does not have a statute providing for State wild and scenic river designation.

II. Application

This strategy can be applied where a free-flowing river or stream segment is at least 25 miles long and bordered by a visually appealing landscape. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act defines river segments as wild, scenic, and recreational:

> Wild river areas are free of impoundments and generally inaccessible except by trail, with watersheds or shorelines essentially primitive and waters unpolluted. Scenic river areas are free of impoundments, with shorelines largely undeveloped, but accessible in places by roads. Recreational river areas are readily accessible by road or railroad, that may have some development along their shorelines, and that may have undergone some impoundment or diversion in the past.

The Forest Service and Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service have published clarifying guidelines for determining river segment classifications.

Although the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the HCRS may be able to initiate action by local interest, the local citizens themselves must organize and demonstrate local support to convince their Member(s) of Congress to introduce a bill. Also, the HCRS is conducting a national inventory to determine suitable river segments to recommend to Congress for detailed study.

Congress must pass a bill authorizing a study of the river in question. Such bills must go through the legislative process, including hearings before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. If a study bill passes and is signed by the President, the Forest Service--if the river flows through a National forest, or the HCRS in all other cases--will work with State and local officials to inventory the river's resources and solicit views of the local landowners and citizens. The study may cost approximately $200,000. If the river proposed meets the criteria, the study team will recommend:

- Classification of various river segments

- Acreage to be included in the river corridor
- Acquisition of land and easements
- Development of recreational facilities
- Assignment of a managing agency

The study report, along with a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and a Draft Management Plan, is reviewed by agencies including the FWS and the state fish and game agency, by the public, and then submitted to Congress and the President. After clearance by the Office of Management and Budget, the President makes a recommendation to Congress. Given sufficient interest, Congress will schedule hearings to discuss the study report. Congress is free to accept all, some or none of the recommendations. If Congress passes a bill which approves the designation(s) and the President signs it, the agency to administer the river segment will prepare detailed boundaries for the river corridor and prepare a Comprehensive Management and Development Plan. Congress must then appropriate money for acquisition of land and easements, construction of visitor facilities, and operating expenses such as salaries of river administrators.

The Congressional designation of a river segment takes several years from the time that Congress authorizes a study. Once a river is declared a study river, it must be designated within 10 years or dropped from consideration. However, the Federal Act protects the river segment under study from the authorization, funding and construction of water resource development projects, as well as restricts development above and below the study segment which would have an adverse effect. The Secretary (Interior or Agriculture) charged with the administration of the river segment would determine if the values for which the river was designated would be adversely affected by development. The Act also protects these rivers for up to three years after the study report is submitted to Congress and the President, regardless of whether or not the river is to be included in the system. All minerals located on Federal lands within one-quarter mile of a study river are withdrawn from prospecting or leasing during the study period.

III. Illustration

In 1968 the Upper Rio Grande in New Mexico was designated for "instant" inclusion into the Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers System, P.L. 90-542. Its designation represented the culmination of studies, recommendations, and Congressional hearings initiated in 1962 by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior. A total of 52.75 miles of the Rio Grande is included in the system with 51.75 miles designated as a wild and 1 mile designated as recreational.

Reconnaissance studies and source document analysis were conducted during the years 1963-1964 principally by the FWS, BLM, FS, and several New Mexico State agencies, which included the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. Cost estimates were unavailable for this study. Interagency coordination was effectuated by HCRS, formerly the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation established in 1963. Both FWS and New Mexico Department of Game and Fish involvement focused on the development of a fish and game data base. Although, these agencies conducted field studies, much of the resource data was gleaned from existing source materials.

Management of the Rio Grande is assumed by BLM and the FS. BLM manages a total of 44.15 miles of the river, 43.90 miles wild and .25 miles recreational; the FS manages a total of 8.60 miles, 7.85 miles wild and .75 miles recreational.

The Rio Grande is considered to be one of the most attractive rivers in the country. The Rio Grande River supports a high quality rainbow and brown trout fishery and high cliffs along the river provide habitat for eagles.

The maintenance of instream flows in the Rio Grande canyon is assured through the river's wild and recreational status. This is based upon the following:

- Presence of a large underground reservoir which assures continued minimum spring flow under existing and expected conditions
- Prior downstream water commitments and legal requirements will tend to prevent the appropriation of water from the designated area
- No department or agency of the United States may recommend authorization of any water resource project that would have a direct and adverse effect on the values for which this wild river was established (Public Law 90-542, the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act).

IV. Evaluation

The Rio Grande River is the only Wild and Scenic River in New Mexico. The FWS believe that a private organization is lobbying for designation of the Gila River as a study river. Both the FWS and the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish indicate that the Rio Grande probably would have not been included in the System if significant development was occuring or planned for the surrounding area. This assessment would, also, appear to be relevant to other New Mexico rivers considered for Wild and Scenic designation in the future.

The designation of a river or stream segment under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (section 13, part c) tends to reserve flows in quantities sufficient to accomplish the purposes of the Act. The Act prohibits new water resource development in the designated segment and restricts water resource development upstream and downstream which would adversely affect the designated river segment. It is a serious shortcoming, however, to take this approach to reserving flows without actually quantifying the streamflow regime that underlies the wild or scenic river designation, and monitoring the flows to ensure their maintenance, possibly by augmenting deficient flows with reservoir releases upstream from designated segments. The Act does not prohibit existing water users along a designated river segment from continuing their use; it only prohibits new appropriations. In fact, the Act states that any taking by the United States of a water right which is vested under either state or Federal law at the time a river is included in the national system shall entitled the owner to just compensation.

Inclusion in the System also protects the river segment from Federally funded water resource development. Therefore, no Federally funded dams and reservoirs will be built on designated river segments. However, this in no way guarantees that sufficient flows will occur to preserve the developed fish and wildlife resources. Some means of linking instream flow needs of fish and wildlife to this process for streamflow protection will be necessary. In 1977 the FWS, in conjunction with western state fish and game agencies, conducted a study which identified and mapped stream segments having substantial fish and wildlife value. The results from this study may be used by the HCRS when it expands its own study in 1978 to identify additional stream segments for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Future effectiveness of this strategy will depend on developing and maintaining local support and be constrained by the substantial costs involved in its implementation. The Congressional approval required to study a river segment and include it in the national system may take several years. Nevertheless, the strategy does provide for a permanent maintenance of historical flows and prohibits future Federal development. Its future effectiveness will hinge most of all on relating streamflow maintenance to quantifiable fish and wildlife values. This quantitative link is not inherent in the National Wild and Scenic River Act, but it may be possible to bridge the gap administratively.

Sources

1. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Wild and Scenic River, Outdoor Recreation Action, 1977.

2. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and Forest Service, Guidelines for Evaluating Wild, Scenic and Recreational River Areas Proposed for Inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System Under Section 2, Public Law 90-542, February 1970.

3. Hale, Arthur, Biologist, retired, Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado, Private Communication, March 1978.

4. Kobes, Karl G., Biologist, retired, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

5. Louisiana State University, 1977 Scenic River's Symposium, Pre-Symposium Compilation of Papers, June 1977.

6. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director - Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

7. Pacific, Robert D., Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

8. The River Conservation Fund, Flowing Free, A Citizen's Guide for Protecting Wild and Scenic Rivers, 1977.

9. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Amended, P.L. 94-486, October 12, 1976, (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287)

STATE DEFINITION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS

Determination of a river as being navigable under State statute provides the opportunity to ensure that flows remain sufficient to support navigation, and also allows the maintenance of the aquatic habitat for fish and wildlife. Apparently, New Mexico has adopted the Federal test of navigability, wherein navigability is a question of fact as to whether or not the body will support commerical navigation (Wreyford V. Arnold, 82 N.M. 156, 477, P. 2d 332 (1970)). In spite of this definition there are neither statutory nor administrative provisions in New Mexico for maintaining a river as navigable by prohibiting new appropriations. The adopted judicial definition of navigability presently has no bearing on preserving a river as navigable.

If this situation changes in the future, it may be possible for the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish or any interested party to petition the State Engineer to deny new appropriations on a river if they should threaten its navigability.

Source

1. Dewsnup, Richard, L., and Dallin W. Jensen, Identification, Description, and Evaluation of Strategies for Reserving Flows for Fish and Wildlife, February 1977.

2. Mutz, Philip, Staff Engineer, New Mexico State Engineer's Office, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.

STATE-FEDERAL INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION

I. Identification

Whenever a Federal agency constructs, modifies, or licenses a reservoir project, it must consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish to obtain and consider their recommendations concerning fish and wildlife resource preservation and development, including the provision of instream flow. Refining and formalizing this consultative process is the goal of this strategy. The formulation and adoption of interagency agreements, construction or permit agency regulations or formal procedures, and strict enforcement of these requirements are tactics available to implement this strategy.

The legal or administrative basis for this strategy is the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) and the regulations or procedures the Federal construction and permit agencies have developed to implement the Act. The FWCA (P.L. 85-264) passed in 1958, expanded upon the Act that created the FWS in 1946 (P.L. 79-232). The FWCA requires that full consideration be given to the recommendations of the FWS; the 1946 Act only required consultation between the construction agency and the Federal and state fish and game agencies.

II. Application

The FWS, the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish and a private interest group are the parties who would instigate this strategy. At the present time, neither the Bureau of Reclamation, Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service nor Bureau of Land Management have an interagency agreement with the FWS at either the regional or headquarters level to implement the FWCA. The Corps of Engineers has a cooperative agreement with the FWS, enacted in 1954. This agreement will be discussed as an illustration of this strategy. All of these agencies, though, do have formalized procedures to implement the FWCA. In addition, the Corps will soon be issuing regulations concerning their implementation of the FWCA. A review of these procedures and proposed regulations is necessary to assess the decision making and costs involved in implementing this strategy.

According to the Bureau of Reclamation policy, coordination in all phases of planning should include:

- Early notification by the BR of the initiation of planning studies
- Opportunity for the FWS to participate in the formulation and evaluation of project plans
- Opportunity for the FWS to provide reports to the BR, including recommendations relating to fish and wildlife aspects of plans or proposals.

FWS reports on BR projects are funded by the Bureau. Congress allocates funds to the FWS through the BR's Washington office which disburses funds to the FWS through the Regional Offices. Beginning in 1978, such funds will not be earmarked in the appropriation act and disbursed from Washington, but rather will be transferred at the field level.

Although not referring explicitly to the FWCA, the SCS procedures do specify that Federal and state fish and wildlife agencies be encouraged to participate actively in project planning and to incorporate measures needed in each project to the maximum extent feasible. According to Forest Service procedures,

> . . . it will be the policy of the Forest Service to refer to the Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the appropriate state fish and wildlife agency, all proposed projects which have a potential for affecting fish and wildlife resources to such an extent as to warrant the investigation and recommendations of these agencies.

The BLM's regulations and procedures do not refer to the FWCA, but their new organic act, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-579), indicates that fish and wildlife values will be considered in granting permits for rights-of-way. Conditions to guarantee these values, such as minimum releases from reservoirs to augment instream flows, can be inserted in the permits.

The Corps draft regulations stipulate that the District Engineer, at least every six months, provide the Regional Director of the FWS with information concerning all pre- and post-authorization studies. This information will be helpful to the FWS in making decisions on personnel requirements and preparing investigative schedules. The draft regulations also require the District Engineer to notify the Regional Director of the initiation of any project investigation and coordinate with the FWS throughout the investigation. The District Engineer must consider to the fullest extent practicable the recommendations of the fish and wildlife agencies.

Beginning with FY 1978, funds for the FWCA studies will no longer be budgeted as line items and transferred at the headquarters level. Rather, the District Engineer, after consultation with the FWS Regional Director, will include in his budget the funds necessary for the FWS to comply with the FWCA. The new draft regulations state that local entities must pay for the cost of water released for instream purposes. Also, local entities must furnish assurances that appropriate action will be taken to prevent downstream withdrawals of water that could negate fishery benefits credited to such releases.

In pursuing this strategy, the FWS can seek agency regulations or interagency agreements based on unilaterally adopted procedures, attempt to strengthen present procedures, or see that they are enforced on a project by project basis. If interagency agreements or agency regulations are to be drawn up, or existing procedures made more stringent, the required decision making would occur at the policy-making level of the FWS, not at the field level. To enforce the existing procedures, however, decision making must be at the field level.

In terms of personnel, time and money, the costs involved in implementing this strategy could be quite high. They would vary depending on the tactic that is used. Of the several tactics available, enforcing existing procedural requirements would probably incur the highest cost because it involves project by project application, yet this tactic may carry the greatest payoff.

III. Illustration

In 1954, the FWS and Corps of Engineers enacted an interagency agreement to cover the Coordination Act of August 14, 1946 which, when subsequently amended, became the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) of 1958. This agreement established guidelines for CE consideration of FWS recommendations for fishery preservation in planned water resource projects.

These guidelines stipulated that the District Engineer shall incorporate in a project report all recommendations of the FWS which are satisfactory to him, including, of course, recommended instream flow reservations. The District Engineer must explain in the report his reasons for rejecting those recommendations he found unsatisfactory. Although there is no provision in this interagency agreement for pre-project coordination, the CE is supposed to include fish and wildlife conservation as a project purpose if the effects of a project on fish and wildlife resources would be significant.

This agreement has not had much impact in New Mexico because few CE projects were planned or constructed from 1946 to 1958 in this State.

IV. Evaluation

It is difficult to determine the utility of this overall strategy. It is first necessary to ascertain what effect the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 has had on reserving instream flows. Strengthening the implementation of the Act through the application of the various tactics covered under this strategy could be expected to increase the probability of flow reservations.

A study performed by Enviro Control of instream flow recommendations made in Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming indicated that flows recommended after the 1958 amendments (FWCA) were accepted more often than prior to that time. The fishery was maintained or improved more often in the post-1958 projects than in the projects built before that time. However, there are no reliable statistics to gauge the success of flow recommendations in the last few years when procedures have become even more stringent.

Although the passage of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 may have helped to reserve instream flows, making this Act more effective is the goal of this overall strategy. Enacting interagency agreements may be a promising tactic. On the other hand, the CE 1954 agreement is the only one presently operative. Construction and permit agencies probably would be unwilling to draw up such rigorous agreements since their own formalized procedures already contain most of the features in such an agreement. A distinct advantage of interagency agreements, in contrast to unilateral agency procedures, is that the FWS would have more of an opportunity to insert provisions it deems necessary. Also, an interagency agreement may imply more commitment on the part of the cooperating agencies. These characteristics, though, may explain why the Federal construction and permit agencies prefer merely formalizing their own procedures. New Mexico FWS personnel are optimistic that the funding arrangements between regional offices of the BR, CE and FWS will enhance the adequacy of FWS field studies necessary for substantiating its fish and wildlife recommendations to constructing agencies. Apparently the FWS office in New Mexico has not received adequate funding in the past to conduct detailed field studies. THe FS and BLM have vast holdings in New Mexico, but their activities are rarely concerned with water resource projects, thus limiting the utility of this Act in New Mexico.

Another constraint upon the effectiveness of this strategy is the lack of an enforcement mechanism. If a field office of a permit or construction agency does not conform with its own procedures or an interagency agreement, the FWS can take no action other than lodging a complaint with the offending agency. The pending adoption of CE regulations is a step in the right direction because the regulations will have the force of law. Concerning the Forest Service and the BLM, regulations to be issued in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-579) may also afford further protection to fish and wildlife. The FS and BLM have vast holdings in New Mexico, but their activities are rarely concerned with water resource projects, thus limiting the utility of this Act in New Mexico.

The strengthening of present procedures, even to the extent of adopting formal regulations which are more binding, may prove a promising tactic. The National Wildlife Federation has filed petition in 1977 with the Department of the Interior, Department of the Army and the Council on Environmental Quality to compel Federal construction and operating agencies to adopt formal procedures in reviewing FWS recommendations for mitigating the adverse impact of development upon fish and wildlife habitats. The petition seeks to alleviate the dependency of the FWS on the construction agencies for transfer funds by having mitigative features funded and implemented concurrently with tproject construction, or in advance of project construction where there may be interference with the achievement of mitigative goals.

The Wildlife Federation is optimistic that the petitioned agencies will draft formal review procedures. However, the agencies are not expected to fully comply with the petition, but they are expected to take significant steps toward the desired end. For instance, the Corps has drafted new procedures and regulation but they will not be formalized until other petitioned agencies complete their drafts. This petition relies upon existing legislation (FWCA) which avoids the pitfalls of introducing new legislation into Congress.

Another promising tactic is promoting the enforcement of existing procedures and regulations. The construction and license agencies, having issued these requirements, are officially committed to them. Issued by the agencies' main offices in Washington, D.C., these procedures or regulations are not always adhered to in the field. This may be attributed negligence or mere unfamiliarity on the part of the construction and permit agencies. Also, some FWS Field Offices may be unaware of construction and permit agency procedures.

The major costs involved with the tactics subsumed under this general strategy would result from drafting procedures, regulations or agreements, and attempting to convince the construction or permit agencies to adopt them. The costs, to a large extent, are a function of the cooperation proffered by the agencies solicited.

A major constraint on the effectiveness of this strategy would be the difficulty the FWS would have in determining whether or not the procedural requirements are being honored. FWS knowledge of project planning and development depends on notification by the construction or permit agency. Notification may be delayed until late in the planning phase. Conceivably, the FWS would spend substantial time and effort in trying to be cognizant of project planning programs if it is not properly notified.

Even if proper notification is made, successful implementation of agency procedures for cooperation with fish and wildlife interests is dependent on the availability of funding and personnel. The FWS incurs significant cost when detailed investigations are conducted in the field and subsequent recommendations are formulated for planned projects such as dams and reservoirs. Although the construction agencies transfer funds to the FWS for this purpose, these may not be adequate. Hopefully, this situation may improve, at least as it involves the BR and CE, because of the new funding procedure that the Bureau and Corps will initiate in fiscal year 1978. Transfers of General Investigation funds will be made at the regional level following negotiations of appropriate amounts with the respective FWS Regions. These transfers will be made by memoranda of agreement executed by the affected agency field offices. This new communication at the field level could result in greater funding.

Sources

1. Enviro Control, Inc., *Assessment of Effects of Altered Stream Flow Characteristics on Fish and Wildlife*, Task 3, August 1976.

2. Kaighn, Robert, Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C., Private Communication, July 1977.

3. Nash, Richard, Planner, Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D.C., Private Communication, July 1977.

4. National Wildlife Federation, Petition for Rulemaking Under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, July 1, 1977.

5. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director-Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.

6. Pacific, Bob, Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, Marcy 1978.

7. P.O. 94-579, *Federal Land Policy and Management Act* of 1976.

8. Tucker, John, Forest Service, Washington, D.C., Private Communication, July 1977.

9. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Service Manual, January 1969.

10. United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, *Watershed Protection Handbook*, May 1973.

11. United States Department of Army, Corps of Engineers, *Planning: Preservation and Enhancement of Fish and Wildlife Resources*, August 1973.

12. United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Commissioner, letter to Martin Lewis, Enviro Control, Inc. (concerning consultative process between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife Service), July 12, 1977.

13. United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Commissioner, memorandum to Regional Directors (concerning coordination with the Fish and Wildlife Service on project planning). December 15, 1976.

FEDERAL LICENSE AND PERMIT STIPULATIONS

I. Identification

The inclusion of a minimum flow stipulation in a dam and reservoir project license or permit ensures that flows will be required to be released as a matter of legal right. To ensure that minimum flows are legally required as an integral part of project operations, it is essential that fish and wildlife interests take an active part in the licensing or permit process involved with an application for use of land and water under Federal ownership or control.

The legal basis for this strategy in relation to Forest Service and BLM-controlled lands derives from the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (P.L. 95-579). Conversations with the FS and BLM have pointed out that, until pending regulations are issued pursuant to P.L. 94-579, the permit process for these agencies will continue to maintain vestiges of previous legislation which regulated acquisition of Federal lands. The legal basis with regard to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission derives from the regulatory authority of the FERC over the non-Federal hydroelectric industry. As a quasi-judicial commission of the Department of Energy, it licenses construction, operation and maintenance of dam and reservoir projects utilizing waters and land of the United States under mandates of the Federal Power Act of 1920 and other Federal laws.

II. Application

This strategy may be utilized when it is determined that a minimum instream flow is needed downstream from a proposed reservoir project requiring a permit or license or subject to relicensing. Participating parties in this strategy would be the Federal agency in control of the affected land and water resources, the project permittee or licensee, and an interested party advocating fish and wildlife interests such as the FWS or New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. In the case of an FERC-regulated project, any person or group of persons whose participation may be in the public interest could participate.

The permit processes followed by the Forest Service and BLM are similar. This discussion will focus on this process as it relates to the Forest Service. Presently, the critical point at which fish and wildlife interests may exert pressure for instream flow stipulations in the project permit occurs after the applicant has submitted a plan of construction, operation, and rehabilitation of the proposed right-of-way in National Forests. At this time, an impact survey is performed by the FS which must contain the "views of the Fish and Wildlife Service. . . and State fish and game departments where fishery and wildlife values are of importance. The Forest Supervisor will ask the Fish and Wildlife Service and State fish and game departments for a report." At this point the interested fish and game agency should submit its minimum flow recommendations and any studies documenting the efficacy of the suggested flow regime in providing for fish and wildlife habitats.

Upon receiving the plans of the applicant and reviewing the completed impact survey, the FS determines whether the land in question can accommodate the proposed use. If an affirmative determination is made, a permit is granted.

Permits normally contain a list of terms and conditions. Section 505 of P.L. 94-579 states that one of the purposes of the terms and conditions is to minimize damage to scenic and aesthetic values and fish and wildlife habitats, and to otherwise protect the environment. Upon granting the permit with accompanying terms and conditions, the applicant must submit detailed plans of construction to the FS. If these plans comply with requirements of the permit, construction may then proceed.

Within this process, it is important that the interested fish and wildlife agency make a specific instream flow recommendation to the Forest Supervisor when asked to comment on potential project impact. Such action will ensure that a minimum instream flow will be considered for inclusion in the final project permit as part of the terms and conditions of project operations.

In the FERC licensing process, there are two critical points at which proponents of this strategy may exert influence. The first point occurs during the applicants' preparation of the Application for License of which Exhibit S is a component. Exhibit S, as described in 18.CFR 4.41, Rules of Practice and Procedure requires that:

> The Applicant shall prepare this exhibit on the basis of studies made after consultation and in cooperation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior and appropriate state fish and wildlife agencies. . . The Exhibit shall include a statement on the nature and extent of applicants' consultation and cooperation with the above agencies.

It is thus essential that fish and wildlife interests make a concerted and organized contribution to this process involving Exhibit S at an early stage in project planning to sensitize the applicant to the importance of instream flow needs and guarantee coverage of this issue in the application review.

The second point at which fish and wildlife advocates may apply their influence occurs after the Application for License is submitted to the FERC. Upon its receipt, the FERC reviews the application to determine whether or not it fulfills the requirements of Rules of Practice and Procedure. Public notice of application is then given, specifying a final date for filing protests, notices of intervention or petitions to intervene. Concurrent with this notification, copies of the completed application are disseminated to Federal agencies and other interested parties for comment and review.

Upon review of the application and determination that instream flow needs are not adequately provided for, an interested party can petition the FERC to intervene in the applicant's licensing. It is essential that such petitions be made before the final date specified by the Commission; otherwise, the petitions may be rejected as "untimely." Section 1.8d of Rules of Practice and Procedure does state that "in extraordinary circumstances for good cause shown, the Commission (may authorize) a late filing." In the event that a petitioner's right to intervene is granted, a hearing is scheduled to resolve the difference. However, prior to the hearing, it often happens that the applicant and the petitioner meet informally and resolve the issue.

Prior to scheduling a hearing, the FERC is also empowered to authorize a Technical Session in which FERC staff meets with the interested party and the applicant in order to clarify the issue, and if possible, resolve it. If resolution is not accomplished in either an informal meeting between the applicant and the intervenor or in the Technical Session, a pre-hearing conference is arranged by the FERC's Office of General Counsel. At this time, the issue is further defined and another attempt is made at resolution. Finally, if the issue is still unresolved, a hearing is scheduled before an Administrative Law Judge of the FERC. Both parties present their case and a decision is made and transmitted to the Commission. This final hearing decision is not binding on the decision of the five-man Commission; however, the decision of the Commission is usually in agreement with hearing findings.

The term of license for most FERC projects is 50 years. The process followed for relicensing of projects is identical to the process discussed previously except that an Exhibit S is not required.

In connection with the Forest Service or BLM permit process, the costs associated with this strategy are limited to those incurred during preparation of the fish and wildlife input to the impact survey. The magnitude of the instream flow study and time associated with preparing the report submitted to the permit agency as part of this input would be the principal cost determinants.

For FERC-licensed projects, the costs linked with this strategy are directly dependent on the extent of agreement between the intervenor and the applicant. Expenditures of time and money increase as negotiations advance through the informal meeting stage to the FERC hearing stage. Occasionally, instream flow studies must be performed to provide data for a decision. The studies are authorized at an informal level or as a result of an FERC hearing. The funding for these studies is normally supplied by the utility company applicant. Most likely the studies would be performed by the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish.

III. Illustration

This strategy has not been implemented in New Mexico; therefore, an illustration from Wyoming demonstrates the utility of this strategy. The Forest Service granted a special use permit to the Dome Lake Reservoir Company on October 7, 1970, for the construction of Sawmill Reservoir on Sawmill Creek in the Big Horn National Forest. A minimum flow of 4 cfs or the inflow, whichever was less, was stipulated in the special use permits. Apparently this stipulation has been complied with.

A 4-cfs flow or the natural streamflow, whichever is less, was recommended below the Sawmill Creek Project by the FWS in a 1969 letter report. This recommendation was developed from a joint field investigation conducted by the FWS, the FS, and the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission during June 1969. This flow was intended to protect the Eastern brook trout fishery. Since project completion, the fishery has apparently been preserved. However, because streamflow records are unavailable to document actual compliance, the effect of the flow stipulation is somewhat inconclusive. The only significant cost associated with this recommendation was the staff effort to conduct the field study and prepare the report.

IV. Evaluation

This strategy has not been applied in New Mexico for several factors. First, there are no FERC projects in the State. Furthermore, at FS- or BLM-permitted projects, little or no water is available for flow releases to maintain the aquatic habitat.

Despite past success in other States, there have been some constraints on the strategy's effectiveness. Applicants were understandably wary of accepting instream flow recommendations which often were based on very cursory stream investigations, especially when the guarantee of such flows would increase project costs. Although the licensing or permit process contained requirements for consideration of instream flow needs, the inability of the interested party to develop realistic recommendations resulted in either an omission of instream flow stipulations or inclusion of a clause merely guaranteeing "adequate" or "suitable" flows.

Often a project sponsor will agree to supply minimum flows on an informal, non-contractual basis. Such "gentlemen's agreements" have sometimes been responsible for maintaining fisheries below reservoir projects; however, more often than not, the absence of a compelling legal force guaranteeing minimum reservoir releases results in a sponsor withholding flows during critical periods of competitive user needs. If the license or permit stipulates flow releases, the licensee or permittee is legally obligated to provide them. Most other instream flow strategies do not lead to as strong a legal obligation.

The future utilization of this strategy may be enhanced as a result of the current research on instream flows needs. Also, further consideration may be given to instream flows in FS and BLM projects with the implementation of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-579).

Sources

1. American Fisheries Society, Proceedings of the Symposium and Speciality Conference on Instream Flow Needs, September 1976.

2. Bellesi, Lou, Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C., Private Communication, July 1977.

3. Dexter, Donald W., Assistant Director, Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Cheyenne, Wyoming, Private Communication, December 1977.

4. Edson, Quentin, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C., Private Communication, July 1977.

5. Enviro Control, Inc., Assessment of Effects of Altered Stream Flow Characteristics on Fish and Wildlife, August 1976.

6. Federal Power Commission, 1975 Annual Report, January 1976.

7. Federal Power Commission, Standardized Conditions for Inclusion in Preliminary Permits and Licenses Issued under Part I of the Federal Power Act, October 1975.

8. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director - Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

9. Pacific, Robert D., Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

10. Shumway, Dean, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C., Private Communication, July 1977.

11. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, A letter of review sent to the Forest Services concerning an application for a special use permit to construct Sawmill Reservoir, October 17, 1969.

STATE ALLOCATION OF RESERVOIR SPACE

The strategy to obtain reservoir space for fisheries in reservoirs constructed or licensed under State law is not available in New Mexico because no statutory or institutional basis exists for its implementation.

Sources

1. Dewsnup, Richard L., and Dallin W. Jensen, Identification, Description, and Evaluation of Strategies for Reserving Flows for Fish and Wildlife, February 1977.

STATE PURCHASE AND LEASE OF WATER RIGHTS

I. Identification

Contractual arrangements to reserve instream flows include the direct purchase of flow rights, the leasing of water rights, and the purchase of shares in a mutual water company. The legal basis of this strategy lies in the general provisions of the New Mexico Stat., §§ 53-1-1 and 53-1-8. This statute implicitly empowers the New Mexico Game and Fish Commission to acquire waters by purchase and lease and implicitly empowers the Commission to purchase shares in a mutual water company. This authority may be construed to encompass the purchase of reservoir storage. The five member New Mexico Game and Fish Commission is the policy making body for the Department of Game and Fish.

II. Application

The New Mexico Game and Fish Commission might acquire direct flow rights and reservoir storage by purchase, lease, and the purchase of shares in a mutual water company pursuant to New Mex. State., §§ 53-1-1 and 53-1-8. The Game and Fish Commission does not have any programs for the purchase or lease, or direct flow rights or reservoir storage to protect instream flows. The acquisition of reservoir storage might be used by the Department of Game and Fish to provide for reservoir releases to maintain instream flows below a dam. The lease of water rights provides only an interim solution, but could be applied to protect a valuable fishery in a particular stream where no permanent supply of flows is available for purchase. A mutual water company is a corporation usually organized by landowners to acquire water for domestic and agricultural use in a designated area. Each shareholder receives a pro rata amount of water based upon the number of shares owned in the company. To employ this arrangement, the Game and Fish Commission, a private party or conservation organization would purchase shares in a mutual water company to acquire instream rights and leave their entitled water in the stream.

The major cost of implementing this strategy is, of course, the high price of water rights which has risen dramatically in the last few years and will probably continue to rise in the future. However, the acquired water right might be sold to be exercised where few instream values worth preserving exist, therby drfraying part of the acquisition cost. Other costs include expenditures of personnel and funds for studies to identify streams where a purchase would have the greatest benefit and the substantial effort to negotiate for the purchase.

III. Illustration

This strategy has not been implemented in New Mexico for flow releases, but the following illustration from Colorado serves to demonstrate the past utility of this strategy. In 1977 the Colorado Division of Wildlife purchased 1 cfs in Boulder Creek above the City of Boulder. It purchased this flow from a private owner for $18,000. The seller was located with the aid of the Nature Conservancy and the Colorado Attorney General's Office.

Although 1 cfs seems to be a small amount of water, this purchase is crucial to preserve the valuable trout fishery in Boulder Creek. The water right purchased is also quite senior, pointing out one of the prime benefits available with this strategy. The importance of this 1 cfs purchase was realized by the Colorado Division of Wildlife while they were studying Boulder Creek as part of their program to implement Senate Bill 97.

IV. Evaluation

Contractual arrangements for the enhancement of instream flows have not been used in the past in New Mexico, and the Department of Game and Fish expects this situation to continue in the future because of signficant constraints on applying this technique. First, the cost of purchasing water rights is considered to be prohibitive, although if the water could be resold downstream this cost would be reduced. Second, reservoir flow releases would become subject to appropriation by downstream users, thus negating the water's intended use. In recognition of such constraints upon the use of this strategy the Department of Game and Fish perfers to establish reservoir fisheries. The Department indicates, however, that if the right circumstances exist, it may utilize this strategy. These constraints also apply to the lease and purchase of shares in a mutual water company to protect instream flows.

Sources

1. Dewsnup, Richard L., and Dallin W. Jensen, Identification, Description, and Evaluation of Strategies for Reserving Flows for Fish and Wildlife, February 1977.

2. Gould, George H., "Preserving Instream Flows Under the Appropriation Doctrine -- Problems and Possibilities", in Instream Flow Information Paper" No. 2, Protecting Instream Flows Under Western Water Law: Selected Papers edited by Berton L. Lamb, September 1977.

3. Kochman, Edward, Biologist, Colorado Division of Wildlife, Denver, Colorado, Private Communication, November 1977.

4. McNall, Warren, Assistant Chief of Fisheries - Research and Management New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

5. New Mexico Department of Game and Fish Letter to Enviro Control, Inc., 24 February 1978 in response to Enviro Control, Inc. Letter to New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, 14 February 1978.

6. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director - Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.

7. Robbins, David W., First Assistant Attorney General, Natural Resources Section, Department of Law, State of Colorado, Private Communication, October 1977.

WATER RESOURCE PLANNING

FEDERAL WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL PLANNING PROGRAMS

I. Identification

Section 13(a) of the Non-Nuclear Research and Development Act of 1974 requires the Water Resources Council (WRC), at the request of the Secretary of the Department of Energy, to undertake assessments of water resource requirements and water supply availability for the development of non-nuclear energy technology. The assessment is to include the environmental impact resulting from the use of water in developing the technology.

The planning process of the WRC derives from the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-90), which was designed to encourage conservation, development, and use of the nation's water and land resources on a comprehensive and coordinated basis by Federal, state and local governments and private enterprise.

II. Application

This strategy would arise whenever the DOE Secretary requests the WRC to undertake a study of water resource requirements in New Mexico for the development of a non-nuclear technology. Other parties which may become involved in the application of this strategy include a river basin commission, a state resource agency, a Federal construction agency, or the FWS. These agencies would become involved in the assessment through delegation by the WRC.

The assessment is similar to a WRC Level A Study in that its geographical scope is a river basin with a coarse level of detail. However, it is distinct because its subject matter is limited to the relationship between water use and the development of non-nuclear technology. Regarding water use, several components must be examined: an analysis of state water laws and state and Federal water rights; an evaluation of the effects of the technological development on water quality; and an analysis of the environmental, social, and economic impact of any change in current use of water resources.

The 13(a) assessment does not specifically call for a study of instream flows; however, such a study can be included as part of the required environmental analysis. The crucial decision involved in implementing this strategy is the weight given to instream flow values by those conducting the assessment.

The primary cost associated with implementing this strategy is the time and personnel needed to conduct the assessment. Although there is no set time in which an assessment must be completed, it usually requires a minimum of ten months at a cost of several hundred thousands of dollars.

III. Illustration

There are no proposed 13(a) assessments for New Mexico; therefore, a proposed study in Colorado serves to illustrate this strategy. An assessment of the water resource requirements for the development of coal and oil shale technology in the Upper Colorado River Basin will be undertaken in 1978 by the State of Colorado through its Department of Natural Resources, and by the State of Utah under delegation by the WRC. The WRC was requested to undertake this study by the DOE Secretary under § 13(a) of the 1974 Non-Nuclear Research and Development Act.

In addition to the States of Colorado and Utah, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Instream Flow Service Group of the Fish and Wildlife Service will participate in the assessment. The latter participation resulted from aggressiveness and a good working relationship between the Instream Flow Service Group and Colorado's Department of Natural Resources. The participation of the Instream Flow organization ensures the consideration of the impacts of coal and oil shale development on instream flows, as it relates to present and future water supply availability and quality. Of course, this assessment will not result in the reservation of any flows, but it will highlight the need to consider instream flow values when planning energy development.

In 1977 Upper Colorado River Basin assessment was scheduled to commence in the very near future. It was to be performed in 10 months and have a budget of approximately $450,000. These funds will be dispersed in both Colorado and Utah.

IV. Evaluation

It is difficult to gauge the past utility of this strategy because it has not been applied in the western states. However, the illustration demonstrates some of the strategy's potential advantages and disadvantages. A major disadvantage is its inability to directly affect an instream flow reservation. However, as a component of the required environmental analysis within the scope of the 13(a) assessment, it might be brought to the attention of the DOE Secretary that private energy development, subsidized by the DOE would not be environmentally in a particular basin, because of the threat to instream flows. It can be argued that this strategy entails a substantial expenditure with a relatively small return on investment as far as instream values are concerned, although other purposes of a water resource assessment may be achieved with economy.

Also, in the above illustration the FWS participated in the § 13(a) assessment; however, these assessments are not required to include input from fish and wildlife agencies. Thus, it is possible that an assessment made in another river basin will not include FWS input. The respective river basin commission is not compelled to contract with the FWS for a study of the potential environmental impacts of future energy development. The commission, at its discretion, may contract with a state agency or private organization for this work.

The primary advantage of this strategy is that it raises the issue of instream flow needs and informs the public of the conflict between instream and offstream water use, and it highlights the potential impacts on instream values resulting from energy development. Considering the building pressure to develop the west's energy resources, it is important that instream values be accounted for. This strategy's future effectiveness depends on how forcefully instream values are weighed in water resource assessments related to energy development.

Although, this strategy has not been applied in New Mexico, yet, discussions with FWS personnel seem to reflect a need for an assessment of the San Juan River generators in the Four Corners Region, and domestic purposes. The demand for water is projected to significantly increase with a proposed coal gasification plant and diversions to Gallup, New Mexico. If these developments occur, as well as associated population growth, trade-offs probably will be made between fish and well as associated population growth, trade-offs probably will be made between fish and wildlife needs and development. At present an excellent trout fishery exists below Navajo Reservoir, which potentially may deteriorate when development and associated diversions occur. A 13(a) assessment would offer an opportunity to direct attention to this potentially critical problem and establish a more equitable balance between fish and wildlife needs and development.

Sources

1. Bayha, Keith, Ecologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Collins, Colorado, Private Communication, November 1977.
2. Bovee, Ken, Aquatic Systems Analyst, Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Collins, Colorado, Private Communication, May 1978.
3. Frost, Jack, Water Resources Council, Washington, D.C., Private Communication, November 1977.
4. McDonald, J. William, State of Colorado, Department of Natural Resources, Denver, Colorado, Private Communication, December 1977.
5. Missouri River Basin Commission, *Work Outline for the Water Assessment of Coal Technologies in the Upper Missouri River Basin, Conducted Under Section 13(a) of the Federal Non-Nuclear Energy Research and Development of 1974*, February 1978.
6. Ohnstad, Don, Principal River Basin Planner, Missouri River Basin Commission, Omaha, Nebraska, Private Communication, May 1978.
7. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director-Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.
8. Pacific, Bob, Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

FEDERAL AID FUNDING TO PURCHASE STORAGE

I. Identification

The Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Programs are supported by a manufacturer's excise tax on certain items of fishing gear, sporting arms and ammunition. These taxes collected by the United States Treasurer are appropriated to the Fish and Wildlife Service which distributes these monies to the states and territories for carrying out the intent of the Federal Aid Programs. Under the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act (P.L. 81-681), known as the Dingell-Johnson Act, funds may be appropriated to the states for the purchase of reservoir storage which, ultimately, could be used as a means of reserving instream flows. Other legislation, which combined with the Dingell-Johnson Act forms the legal basis for Federal Aid Programs, includes the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, known as the Pitman-Robertson Act (P.L. 75-415), and the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act (P.L. 89-304).

II. Application

This strategy may be utilized when the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish determines that the fish and wildlife resources below a reservoir might not be preserved or enhanced except by the purchase of reservoir storage. Parties participating in the implementation of this strategy would be the interested state fish and game agency and the regional FWS Federal Aid office.

The process whereby a state applies for Federal Aid funding is described in the 1973 revision of the Federal Aid Manual. The first document submitted by the state is the Application for Federal Assistance (AFA), which outlines the basic plan for the proposed project. Information pertinent to the environmental and socio-economic impacts of the project as well as budget information and forecasted cash needs are also included in this application. The most important part of the application is the Program Narrative which must address:

- Needs or objectives of the project
- Expected benefits or results
- Approach of the project
- Project location
- Related Federal projects

The AFA in combination with any supporting documents provides the basis for any decision made by the Federal Aid Office. If the proposed project is in accordance with specifications of the Federal Aid Program, a Project Agreement is issued. The Project Agreement outlines the period of agreement between the state and the U.S. government and the respective cost share of each entity during the period of development. Care must be taken that matching funds come from state sources; a project cannot be approved if it depends upon another Federal program for its matching funds.

Costs are incurred by the state and Federal governments in the implementation of this strategy. Prior to submitting an AFA, the state must expend funds to determine which streams are in need of increased flows. Additional costs are borne by the state in revising AFA's which the Federal Aid office determines to be incomplete or insufficiently detailed.

III. Illustration

Federal Aid monies have not yet been used in New Mexico to purchase reservoir storage for instream flows, so an example from Utah is cited here to illustrate the utility of this strategy. Long Park Reservoir Project, operated by the Sheep Creek Irrigation Company, will be located on Sheep Creek in the Ashley National Forest within Dagget County, Utah. Sheep Creek is a feeder of Flaming Gorge Reservoir operated by the Bureau of Reclamation. A clearing permit was secured from the Forest Service and elimination of trees from the reservoir site was completed in the spring of 1977. Construction of the reservoir began in October 1977 with an estimated completion date of October 1978. At the present time, the Sheep Creek Irrigation Company acquires water from four high mountain impoundments--Daggett. Tamarack, Jesson and Spirit Creek between the site of the proposed Long Park Reservoir and the backwater of Flaming Gorge Reservoir.

In its upper and middle reaches, Sheep Creek is a narrow stream located in a constricted canyon. In its lowermost three miles, Sheep Creek Canyon expands in its course toward Flaming Gorge Reservoir. This reach sustains the spawning of rainbow and brown trout which emerge from the reservoir in the months of April (rainbow) and October and November (brown). In past years, to secure adequate storage for irrigation needs, the operating schedules of the four high mountain reservoirs stipulated that flows would not be passed in Sheep Creek during the months of spring run-off storage or during the fall non-irrigation months. Therefore, the spawning of rainbow and brown trout was hindered in the lower 3 to 4 miles of Sheep Creek.

In 1974, the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) was notified that planning had been undertaken by the Sheep Creek Irrigation Division and the Soil Conservation Service for the proposed 13,700 acre-foot Long Park Reservoir. On June 14, 1976, the DWR submitted an AFA to the Fish and Wildlife Service. In the Narrative Statement of this application, the DWR made the following proposals:

- Purchase three of the four high mountain lakes from the irrigation company so that these impoundments could be stabilized
- Purchase a 3,000 acre-foot conservation pool to maintain a trout fishery in the new reservoir
- Purchase 720 acre-feet of water which could be bypassed at the Long Park Reservoir Diversion Dam to enhance the fishery habitat in the lower four miles of Sheep Creek.

According to the agreement between Sheep Creek Irrigation Company and the Division of Wildlife Resources, no water will be diverted from Sheep Creek between December 1 and March 31; however, from the 720 acre-feet of active storage acquired, 4 cfs will be bypassed each spring from the Lower Sheep Creek Diversion Dam for the first 30 days after water from Sheep Creek is diverted to Long Park Reservoir, and 4 cfs will bypass this diversion dam between October 1 and December 1. These releases are intended to enhance the spawning habitat of Lower Sheep Creek. The DWR has also reported that, if these flows result in improved spawning,channel improvement and riparian revegetation will be carried out in this reach.

On June 30, 1976, the FWS issued a Project Agreement wherein funding in the amount of 75% of project costs or $272,790 was supplied to the DWR for the Long Park Reservoir Project. These funds were to be administered in accordance with the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act and used for the purchase of water rights in the three high-mountain lakes and Long Park Reservoir and to provide for bypass flows at the diversion to Long Park Reservoir.

As indicated by the two-week "turn-around" time between DWR's submission of the AFA and the issuance of an FWS Project Agreement, an AFA thoroughly prepared in accordance with Federal Aid Manual Instructions will ensure timely processing of an application. The critical points in the decision-making process for this strategy are to be found during the State's preparation of the AFA. The successful acquisition of Federal Aid funding is dependent upon:

- Sufficient documentation of the AFA for the proposed project
- Adequate performance in Federal Aid-funded projects which are in progress

In the case of Long Park Reservoir, the major cost incurred by the State was the 25% share ($90,930) of project costs.

IV. Evaluation

This strategy has not been implemented in New Mexico and the Department of Game and Fish indicates that that it would generally not be effective, as reservoir releases would immediately become subject to appropriation by downstream users, thus negating the water's intended uses. It is believed that competition for available reservoir storage results in water costs too great to justify the necessary expenditure of funds.

However, if these circumstances change, the Department must avoid mistakes other states have made which have curtailed its effectiveness. Conversations with officials of the Federal Aid Program indicate that, in the past, delays in project funding have resulted from inadequate documentation of Project Agreements. These agreements between the state and the affected irrigation districts were often vague in delineating post-project responsibilities. Failure by the state to submit reports and vouchers for the previous year's work within the 90-day period specified by Federal Management Circular 74-7 also delayed the processing of an AFA for impending work.

Another impediment to the use of the strategy has been state violation of the Rules and Regulations of the Federal Aid Program (Section 80.5). States become ineligible for Federal Aid funding if funds or real property acquired through this source pass from control of the state fish and game agency or are used for purposes not specified in the Project Agreement. State eligibility is restored when misued funding is compensated or the appropriated property or an equivalentis restored. Adherence to the administrative guidelines of the Federal Aid Programs will improve this strategy's effectiveness.

Sources

1. Blackard, Jerry, Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado, Private Communication, June 1977.

2. Massmann, W.H., 25 Years of Federal-State Cooperation for Improving Sport Fishing, 1976.

3. Massmann, W. H., Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C., Private Communication, June 1977.

4. McNall, Warren, Assistant Chief of Fisheries-Research and Development, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Private Communication, February 1978.

5. New Mexico Department of Game and Fish letter to Enviro Control, Inc., 24 February 1978 in response to Enviro Control, Inc. Letter to New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, 14 February 1978.

6. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director-Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Private Communication, February 1978.

7. Page, Ralph, Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado, Private Communication, November 1977.

8. Project Agreement between Utah Division of Wildlife Resources and Division of Federal Aid, Fish and Wildlife Service (concerning the Long Park Reservoir Project), June 1976.

9. Salvarakus, John, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Salt Lake City, Utah, Private Communication, June 1977.

10. United States Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration, 1974, 1975.

11. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Narrative Statement-Land Acquisition (Conservation Pool), Long Park Reservoir Conservation Pool, June 1976.

FEDERAL RESERVOIR CONSTRUCTION AND ENLARGEMENT

I. Identification

This strategy involves the construction of new dams and reservoirs large enough in capacity to expressly provide for instream flow reservations, or the enlargement of existing dams and reservoirs for this purpose. The legal basis for this strategy is implied in the legislation granting authority to construction agencies to construct and modify reservoir projects. The Bureau of Reclamation derives this power from the Reclamation Act of 1902 and subsequent amendments, especially the important 1939 amendments. The Corps of Engineers is granted construction authority by the various Rivers and Harbor Acts, and the Soil Conservation Service operates under the Small Watershed Protection Act. More specific statutory authority to provide reservoir storage capacity expressly for regulation of streamflow for fish and wildlife needs is contained in Section 102 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-500).

The Anadromous Fish Conservation Act authorizes the Bureau, Corps, Department of Agriculture, and the states to construct dams and reservoirs solely for the purpose of conserving, protecting, and enhancing anadromous fish if the Secretary of Interior deems this action necessary. The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act provides a mechanism through which the Fish and Wildlife Service and State fish and game agencies can implement this strategy.

II. Application

This strategy would be applied when construction agencies first begin planning to construct a new dam or enlarge an existing one. No Federal construction agency, except under the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act, is authorized to build a reservoir solely for fish and wildlife purposes; however, the protection or enhancement of fish and wildlife resources could be made a very important project purpose in a multi-purpose project. The FWS and New Mexico Department of Game and Fish could promote fish and wildlife conservation to the extent that additional storage capacity specifically to sustain and reserve minimum instream flows would be planned. If during initial project planning these agencies learn that planned storage volumes will be insufficient to provide adequate instream flows, they may recommend a larger dam and reservoir and have the additional costs allocated to fish and wildlife benefits.

When construction agencies enlarge existing reservoir projects, they may do so solely for fish and wildlife purposes or for a number of reasons including the preservation or development of fish and wildlife resources. The fish and game agencies would have to convince the construction agencies of the advisability of enlarging a reservoir to ensure reserving instream flows. Relating a minimum flow regime to the storage capacity necessary to its maintenance may require hydrological data and expertise that is difficult for fish and game interests to acquire. Also, fish and wildlife agencies must convince the construction agencies of the economic benefits of this action. The construction agencies are an important beneficiary of this strategy because they can claim valuable economic benefits in constructing larger dams or enlarging dams for fish and wildlife purposes, possibly improving the economic justification of a reservoir project. Marshalling public opinion can be an important component of this strategy. The FWS and the Department of Game and Fish can cooperate with conservation organizations and sportemen's clubs in their negotiations with the construction agencies.

In implementing this strategy, the fish and game agencies must decide which proposed or existing reservoir projects they should investigate or which instream flow and related storage recommendations are most needed. This decision is predicated on the importance of protecting a particular ecological resource and the likelihood that construction agencies will accept and implement the recommendations. The decision making involved is very related to the application of other instream flow strategies (see strategies entitled State-Federal Flow Requests Made Early, State-Federal Combined Storage and Flow Requests and State-Federal Interagency Consultations). The implementation of this strategy also depends on decision making by Congress which must authorize the construction or enlargement of dams and reservoirs.

The total costs could be substantial in implementing this strategy. Costs would be incurred as always in conducting stream investigations to justify the inclusion of flow reservations. In addition, however, developing the hydrological basis for increasing the reservoir capacity to sustain the flow reservation will impose significant study cost.

III. Illustration

This strategy has not been implemented in New Mexico; therefore an illustration is used from Washington to demonstrate its utility. The proposed enlargement of Bumping Lake, a reservoir located on the Yakima River, Washington, provides an illustration of this strategy. The Yakima River had supported a major run of salmon, but with the impoundment of the river during the 1930's this run was all but destroyed. The enlargement of Bumping Lake was planned to rehabilitate the salmon run.

Consideration has been given to enlarging Bumping Lake since 1939 when the Roza Diversion was completed. Originally, the planned enlargement was primarily for increased irrigation storage, but enlarging the lake for this purpose could not be justified economically and, therefore, economic benefits had to be derived elsewhere. A complication was that in the mid-1950's the local irrigators were not enthusiastic over the proposed enlargement because they believed the stored water would be too expensive. For these reasons, the BR decided to allocate substantial storage to other purposes. Influenced by the FWS and the recent passage (in 1958) of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, the Bureau proposed a 458,000 acre-foot reservoir with 324,000 acre-feet allocated to fishery enhancement and only 100,000 acre-feet for irrigation. The Washington Department of Game and the BR are presently negotiating over an optimum storage release schedule to provide for the instream flow needs of salmon.

The decision making involved in implementing this course of action centers around the FWS decision to encourage the BR to enlarge the reservoir for fishery enhancement and the BR's favorable decision largely due to the added economic benefits it could claim to help justify the action. The costs, so far, have been those generally incurred in planning a project modification and have not been substantial. Greater costs may accrue, though, due to delay in construction caused by local opposition. Additional time may be spent in pacifying opposition and in the Congressional authorization process.

Irrigators along the Yakima River oppose allocating a large amount of storage for instream use, and threaten to divert fishery enhancement flows. To guard against this possibility, the Washington Department of Game has suggested that streamflow gauges be installed along the river and irrigators be contractually bound to compensate losses to the ecosystem caused by illegal diversion.

IV. Evaluation

To the present, no reservoir west of the Mississippi River has been built solely for fishery purposes under the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act. Federal construction agencies, though, can include fish and wildlife conservation as a project purpose and can provide substantial reservoir storage to sustain flow releases so as to further this purpose. This approach has been more common in recent years, partially because the construction agencies can maximize their benefit claims by adding to the project purposes, and because of recent environmental legislation and increased environmental consciousness.

To successfully implement this strategy, the FWS and New Mexico Department of Game and Fish must participate early in the planning process with the construction agency and fully understand the allocation of projected reservoir storage. A basis for coordination with construction agencies is provided by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (see strategies entitled State-Federal Combined Storage and Flow Requests, State-Federal Flow Requests Made Early, and State-Federal Interagency Consultations). Although the construction agencies are under no legal or institutional compulsion to adopt the course of action advocated by the fish and game interests, conservation agencies and their private-sector allies are sometimes convincing in bargaining for greater reservoir storage capacity to ensure reserving instream flows. Their persuasiveness depends a good deal on the scope of their knowledge of the hydrological and biological conditions surrounding a planned or existing dam and reservoir project. Although this strategy has not been implemented in New Mexico, Federal construction agencies and state fish and game agencies generally have coordinated more effectively in recent years, thus offering increased promise for this strategy.

Once a construction agency commits itself to build a new dam or enlarge an existing one for purposes including the reservation of instream flows, such a commitment is embodied in authorizing legislation passed by Congress. This legislative action is a primary advantage of this strategy because it has the force of law and expresses Congressional intent to protect instream flows.

Sources

1. Dewsnup, Richard L., and Dallin W. Jensen, Identification, Description, and Evaluation of Strategies for Reserving Flows for Fish and Wildlife, February 1977.

2. Doerksen, Harvey R., WELUT, Letter to Enviro Control, Inc., 22 March 1977.

3. Enviro Control, Inc., Assessment of Effects of Altered Stream Flow Characteristics on Fish and Wildlife, August 1976.

4. Hutchens, Lynne, Program Coordinator, Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Coastal and Anadromous Fisheries, Washington, D.C., Private Communication, July 1977.

5. Kitterman, Gary, Biologist, Bureau of Reclamation, Yakima, Washington, Private Communication, July 1977.

6. Oliver, Wendell, Biologist, Washington Department of Game, Yakima, Washington, Private Communication, July 1977.

7. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director-Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.

8. Pacific, Bob, Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

9. Tuttle, Merrit, Regional Coordinator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Environmental Assessment Branch, Portland, Oregon, Private Communication, July 1977.

WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

STATE WATER RIGHTS RECORDS ANALYZED

I. Identification

This strategy involves locating and analyzing the water rights records for a particular stream as part of the process for securing instream flows. The strategy itself will not ensure an instream flow, but it can be used by the Fish and Wildlife Service and by the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish in formulating tactics when negotiating with construction or operating agencies for minimum instream flows. Any interested party could find this strategy useful in deciding what tactics or further strategy would be appropriate to obtain instream flows in a particular stream.

Negotiations between the FWS, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish and the Federal construction agencies take place in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. This statute is the legal basis of this strategy.

II. Application

The New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, the FWS or any conservation organization can employ this strategy. It is applicable primarily in two situations: when a concerned party seeks to require minimum instream flows; and when the Department of Game and Fish or FWS is bargaining with a Federal construction or operating agency for reservoir releases sufficient to maintain prescribed minimum flows.

Knowledge of the water rights established along a stream reach will aid in selecting the best course of action to reserve instream flows there. For example, if normal streamflows are fully appropriated, a strategy such as filing a junior water right would not be effective, but a strategy such as direct purchase of water rights would be. In contrast, if a stream is not entirely appropriated, an administrative appropriation of instream flow may be applicable.

The Department of Game and Fish or the FWS can bargain more intelligently with the construction or operating agency for prescribed releases from a reservoir if the extent, location and ownership of water rights established below the dam are known. For instance, if the fishery in a certain stream reach required a minimum 15 cfs instream flow, then sufficient reservoir releases should be prescribed so that 15 cfs will remain after all water rights throughout the stream reach have been exercised. Therefore, knowledge of the existing water rights is essential. With this knowledge, a fish and game agency could tie an instream flow recommendation to an existing downstream water right. This bargaining tactic may be useful as a last resort toward reserving an instream flow where protection of fish and wildlife is not recognized legally as a beneficial use of water.

Water rights are a matter of public record in New Mexico. Records are available from the State Engineer, which include records of surface water appropriations since 1907. However, most Indian water rights have not yet been adjudicated. For available records, a private individual, organization, the Department of Game and Fish, or the FWS can ascertain the ownerhsip, the point of diversion, and the date of priority of each water right. The amount of water entitled to the user is recorded according to the amount of water applied to the land, not the amount diverted from the stream channel in order to allow for seepage and evaporation. The cost of securing this information is not great; it is based on copying charges and staff time required to obtain the records.

III. Illustration

This strategy has not been implemented in New Mexico; therefore, an illustration is used from Colorado to demonstrate its utility. Knowledge of a downstream water right enabled a useful tactic in reserving an instream flow in Clear Creek, Colorado, below Georgetown Lake. In May 1969, the FWS recommended a minimum bypass flow of 20 cfs or the inflow to the reservoir, whichever was less. In part, this recommendation was based upon the knowledge of established downstream water rights of 20 cfs. This knowledge was gained through discussions with the State Engineer. A bypass flow of 20 cfs was acceptable to the project. This minimum low flow has usually been maintained, resulting in the preservation of the downstream fishery.

This case illustrates the strategy in a typical situation where the State and Federal fish and game agencies bargain with a Federal permit or construction agency for a minimum release from a reservoir. It does not, however represent an optimum application of the strategy since the flow recommendation merely uses the water right as a crutch; apparently, no analysis of inflows and diversions along the affected stream reach was attempted. The important decision points in applying the strategy in this situation are already institutionalized within the bargaining process. Relatively little cost is involved to gain and apply knowledge of water rights as a tactic in the bargaining process.

IV. Evaluation

Although, the analysis of water rights records has not been used systematically in New Mexico, both the FWS and the Department of Game and Fish consider this strategy to be promising. According to the Department of Game and Fish, the Department periodically reviews water rights records to determine the availability of unappropriated water for reservoir storage. However, Department personnel are unable to conduct a systematic analysis of water rights records for the purposes of this strategy.

While some knowledge of downstream water rights could be applied as an instream flow bargaining tactic, it can be argued that flows would be released from a reservoir to satisfy downstream rights regardless of an agreement between the FWS and Federal construction, operating or permit agency. However, it is advantageous to obtain a formal agreement because the downstream rights eventually might be reduced or terminated. An obvious disadvantage of this tactic, though, is that the flow released to satisfy downstream rights may not be the optimum flow for fish and wildlife purposes.

This strategy's effectiveness is limited because records are incomplete and New Mexico has not established a time schedule for recording all water rights.

Sources

1. Dewsnup, Richard L., and Dallin W. Jensen, Identification, Description, and Evaluation of Strategies for Reserving Flows for Fish and Wildlife, February 1977.

2. Enviro Control, Inc., Assessment of Effects of Altered Stream Flow Characteristics of Fish and Wildlife, Task II, Volume III, August 1976.

3. Knudsen, Walter I., Jr., Chief, Computer Services, Division of Water Resources, Department of Natural Resources, Private Communication, June and November, 1977.

4. Kucin, Ken, Parks and Recreation Commissioner, Georgetown, Colorado, Private Communication, March 1976.

5. Longenbaugh, Robert A., and Norval E., McMillin, A Data Manager Looks at the Development of the Colorado Water Data Bank, January 24, 1974.

6. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director-Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe. New Mexico, Private Communication, February, 1978.

7. Pacific, Bob, Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

8. United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Memorandum to United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (concerning Georgetown Lake and Recreation Area), May 12, 1969.

9. Whitledge, Alora, Colorado State Land Office, Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado, March 1976.

STATE-FEDERAL FLOW REQUESTS MADE EARLY

I. Identification

To offer timely flow recommendations, the Fish and Wildlife Service and New Mexico Department of Game and Fish must be involved in the planning process when Federal agencies, such as the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and Soil Conservation Service, plan the construction of dams and reservoirs. Recommendations that are timely, i.e., made prior to project construction, have a greater chance of acceptance and implementation than those made during or after construction. The legal basis of this strategy is the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 and the planning procedures adopted by the Federal construction agencies.

II. Application

This strategy is applicable when any Federal construction agency is planning a reservoir, particularly in the earlier phases of planning before design and cost options are foreclosed. Also, when the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is considering licensing or relicensing a dam and reservoir project, or when the Bureau of Land Management or Forest Service is in the process of issuing a permit to construct a dam on Federal lands, this strategy would apply. The role of these agencies, however, is treated separately (see strategy entitled Federal License and Permit Stipulations). The Bureau of Indian Affairs manages reservoirs, but reservoirs under its management are constructed by the BR.

As provided by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958, the FWS and the Department of Game and Fish would pursue this strategy. Although it would not be available directly to private parties or public interest organizations, they could play an important role in exerting pressure on the construction agency to accept the fish and wildlife agencies' recommendations.

To apply the strategy, the fish and game agencies must conduct a timely investigation to formulate instream flow recommendations. Application of the strategy is contingent upon prompt notification by the construction agencies of the initiation of project planning. Each construction agency has promulgated procedures to provide for early notification and cooperation with the FWS and the Department of Game and Fish.

A recent letter from the Commissioner of the BR to the Bureau's Regional Directors ordered them to notify the FWS of the initiation of project planning, and provide the FWS with the opportunity to participate in the formulation and evaluation of project plans and to present reports to the BR, including recommendations relating to fish and wildlife aspects of the project plan. The Corps issued procedures dated 15 August 1973 (to be updated in 1978) which require each District Engineer to provide the Federal and state fish and game agencies with advance information on the studies underway in his planning program; notify them of the initiation of the project investigation; continue liaison, including conferences, throughout the investigation; and obtain the recommendations of the fish and wildlife agencies. The SCS has the least stringent requirements for fish and wildlife agency input. Still, their procedures do encourage the Federal and state fish and game agencies to participate actively in project formulation and to incorporate needed measures in each project to the maximum extent feasible.

Once the Federal and state fish and game agencies have been notified of a project plan and brought into the planning process, they must initiate an investigation to develop timely recommendations. Although conducting investigations and formulating instream flow recommendations are usually time-consuming and expensive tasks, an insistence on timely performance could result in additional costs because of the lack of flexibility available to the field office administrator in allocating time of personnel. Also, earlier efforts can be wasted because preliminary construction plans are often changed or abandoned later on.

III. Illustration

Authorized 20 October 1972, Title II of P.L. 92-514, Brantley Dam and Reservoir on the Pecos River is to be constructed by the BR for the purposes of irrigation, flood control, fish and wildlife and recreation, and for the elimination of the hazards of failure of McMillan and Avalon Dams. McMillan and Avalon are upstream and downstream of Brantley site, respectively.

Presently, the Pecos River at the proposed Brantley site supports a warm water fishery throughout the year. Each winter, however, the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish stocks catchable-size trout in the Pecos River below McMillan Dam. Although the trout fishery can be maintained only on a seasonal basis, it is a unique resource in an arid area and of particular value to the people in this region of the state. The New Mexico Department of Game and Fish has successfully maintained the winter trout fishery for over ten years under existing conditions. This is attributed to the fact that a minimum of 8 cfs has historically flowed from Major Johnson Springs and Boiling Springs, below McMillan Dam. However, both springs are upstream from the proposed Brantley Dam site and the stream may be dewatered after the dam is constructed. Presently flows vary from 8 cfs to 200 cfs, averaging approximately 80 cfs, for the 9 miles between the Brantley Dam site and Avalon Reservoir, downstream.

The FWS is an updated Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act report in December 1974, which the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish concurred with, recommended that a minimum instantaneous release of 70 cfs be made at Brantley Dam during the period of 16 May through 31 October; and either 35 cfs or the inflow to Brantley Reservoir, which ever is less, be released during the period of 1 November through 15 May. These flow regimes are to mitigate for fishing losses in the Pecos River segment which would be inundated by Brantley Reservoir.

The BR indicated in a 10 March 1978 memorandum to the FWS that it would be able to incorporate the 70 cfs flow recommendation into the operating plans, but will not be able to provide the 35 cfs recommendation, because BR's water rights may not be senior enough to supply this water. The Carlsbad Irrigation District, recently petitioned the New Mexico State Engineer to administer the water rights in the Pecos River above McMillan Reservoir according to a strict interpretation of the prior appropriation doctrine. Such administration might entail "shutting off" junior rights until all senior rights are completely met. This may affect the water rights the BR is acquiring for project purposes.

Another constraint on meeting the 35 cfs flow recommendation during the non-irrigation season focuses on Avalon Dam downstream from Brantley dam site. The recommended flow would require nearly 7,500 AF of water annually during the winter months. Avalon Reservoir is available below Brantley to store water from the minimum flow; however, BR records indicate that seepage losses from Avalon increase substantially as storage increases. This seepage loss may be as much as 50 percent of the inflow to Avalon during the winter months. The seepage losses at Avalon must be considered as losses to the Carlsbad Irrigation District water supply because it cannot be recaptured downstream for project use.

IV. Evaluation

As illustrated by the Brantley Reservoir Project, this strategy has displayed potential utility in New Mexico. Instream flow recommendations made prior to project construction have resulted in greater acceptance than recommendations made during or after construction. An Enviro Control study of 100 flow recommendations in nine western states including New Mexico revealed that recommendations made prior to construction were accepted without modification significantly more often as compared to those made during or after construction.

In judging the future effectiveness of the strategy, a number of factors must be considered. The strategy is applicable only when a Federal construction agency is building or modifying a project. Such construction will probably decrease in the future when compared to the spate of construction in the 20 years after World War II. Users of this strategy are limited to the FWS and Department of Game and Fish although private individuals or public interest groups can exert some influence with the construction agencies on behalf of the recommendations by the conservation agencies.

The effectiveness of this strategy depends, in large part, on the construction agencies' close adherence to their own adopted procedures concerning early notification of fish and wildlife agencies on project planning matters. Even if the Federal and state fish and game agencies are informed of a project being planned and their inputs are invited, however, they must decide which projects to investigate in depth where a considerable expenditure of limited personnel and funds would be warranted. In addition, to make timely investigations and recommendations, the state and Federal fish and game agencies would be deprived of some flexibility in budgeting and scheduling. Finally, although a timely flow recommendation enjoys a better chance of acceptance, there is no assurance that such a recommendation will not be rejected on some other basis such as the reasonableness of the flow amounts requested.

Despite these constraints, this strategy does have some definite advantages. Offering flow recommendations is already part of an institutionalized process which has been ongoing for 30 years between the fish and wildlife agencies and the Federal construction agencies. This process has a firm legal basis and should be improved in the future. Both the FWS and the Department of Game and Fish indicate that instream flow recommendations will be submitted where necessary for future water resource projects. Negotiations by the FWS and the Department of Game and Fish with Federal constructing agencies are expected to be quite difficult in New Mexico unless fish and wildlife are authorized project purposes. Over appropriation of instream flows in the State will severely limit opportunities to provide for flow releases for fish and wildlife.

Sources

1. Bass, Richard E., Chief-Environmental Branch, Division of Planning, Bureau of Reclamation, Amarillo, Texas, Private Communication, April 1978.

2. Enviro Control, Inc., Assessment of Effects of Altered Stream Flow Characteristics on Fish and Wildlife, Task 3, August 1976.

3. Enviro Control, Inc., Assessment of Effects of Altered Stream Flow Characteristics on Fish and Wildlife, Task 2, Vol. 2, August 1976.

4. Letter to Enviro Control, Inc., from the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, 24 February 1978 in response to letter sent to New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, 14 February 1978.

5. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director-Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.

6. Pacific, Bob, Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

7. United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Watershed Protection Handbook, May 9, 1973.

8. United States Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Planning: Preservation and Enhancement of Fish and Wildlife Resources, August 15, 1973.

9. United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Brantley Project, Definite Plan Report, Revised February 1975.

10. United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Commissioner, Memorandum to Regional Directors (concerning coordination with the Fish and Wildlife Service on project planning), December 15, 1976.

11. United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Regional Director, Memorandum to Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, AA Albuquerque, New Mexico, Concerning Section 404 Permit NM-OYT-0019, Brantley Reservoir, Coordination meeting 23 June 1977.

STATE-FEDERAL FLOW REQUESTS MADE SPECIFIC

I. Identification

Specifying instream flow requirements for a particular stream reach or tributary below a dam and reservoir, and monitoring actual instream flows there to ensure that downstream resource values are protected, involves detailed on-site investigations by the fish and game agency and subsequent stream gaging. Studies such as transect surveys must be performed at downstream locations selected so as to determine the instream flow needs in specific stream reaches below the dam site. Recommendations would then be offered to the construction agency specifying needed flow releases which, if accepted, would be incorporated into the reservoir's operating criteria. Gaging stations, located within the specific downstream reaches, would determine the sufficiency of the actual releases. The legal or administrative basis of this strategy is the interagency consultative process as provided for by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

II. Application

This strategy would be applied when the fishery, rookery or other biotic resource within a reach or tributary remotely downstream from a dam and reservoir project is predicted to be, or is already, adversely affected by project flows. Often, a downstream fishery is threatened by low flows even though a required minimum flow is discharged upstream at the dam. Stream diversions and seepage from the stream channel often are responsible for the diminution of the original flow. Also, fishery flows required directly below the dam may be insufficient within a more remote reach or tributary downstream to satisfy localized fish and wildlife habitat requirements. In both cases, the specification of an instream flow requirement at a particular downstream site in addition to, or in place of a project flow release, and the installation of a streamflow gage will facilitate suitable flows in the remote stream reach or tributary. Furthermore, exact requirements supported by careful field investigations will be more persuasive in seeking any flow reservation.

Advocates of this strategy would be the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish and the FWS. Public interest groups aware of localized fish and wildlife needs and stream conditions could also participate in applying this strategy. Implementation of the strategy requires that instream flow recommendations be provided to the construction or permit agency during the appropriate planning stage (see strategy entitled State-Federal Flow Requests Made Early). For existing projects, reauthorization or relicensing proceedings or administrative reassignment of reservoir storage could be instituted to reserve needed flows and provide gaging stations (see strategies entitled State-Federal Combined Storage and Flow Requests, Federal License and Permit Stipulations, and Federal Reauthorization of Projects).

The principal costs of applying this strategy would result from detailed instream flow field studies performed by the involved fish and wildlife agencies at downstream sites. Installation and maintenance of streamflow gages in the designated stream reaches will account for additional costs.

III. Illustration

This strategy has not been implemented in New Mexico; therefore, an example from Colorado will serve to illustrate its potential. The Fryingpan-Arkansas Project is a multi-purpose Bureau of Reclamation project involving several structures and impacting a number of streams. The operating principles of the Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, finalized in December 1960, agreed to the protection of recreational and environmental values. The principles were incorporated in the 1962 project authorization. Section 7 of the authorizing document provided for bypass flows below diversion dams and Ruedi Reservoir on the West Slope to protect more than 40 miles of important trout streams along the Fryingpan River and its tributaries and about 30 miles of Roaring Fork River and Hunter Creek. Prescribed bypass flows provided for included the following:

Fryingpan River below Ruedi Dam	Fryingpan River upstream from Ruedi Reservoir above the Confluence with the North Fork
39 cfs, Nov - April	30 cfs, Oct - March
110 cfs, remainder of year	100 cfs, April - July
	150 cfs, May
	200 cfs, May
	75 cfs, August
	65 cfs, September
Chapman Creek	**Cunningham Creek**
15 cfs, Oct - March	15 cfs, Oct - March
30 cfs, remainder of year	30 cfs, remainder of year

In order to monitor these flows, the BR agreed to install recording gages where needed. As of 1977, new gages have been installed in Chapman and Cunningham Creeks.

The impetus to include these flow regimes in the authorizing document came from recommendations of the FWS which performed detailed field investigations during the late 1950's and early 1960's. The principal decisions in this example are the FWS decisions to conduct a detailed study, recommend a detailed flow regime and request the installation of gages; and the BR's decisions to accept the FWS recommendations, include them as operating principles in the authorizing document, and to install gages. The primary costs incurred through 1977 have been for the flow studies and gage installation.

IV. Evaluation

This strategy has not been applied in the past in New Mexico, as a result of the apparent absence of opportunities for implementing other strategies (see strategies entitled State-Federal Combined Storage and Flow Requests, Federal License and Permit Stipulations, Federal Reauthorization of Projects, and State-Federal Flow Requests Made Early) which are to be used in conjunction with State-Federal Flow Requests Made Specific. If the strategy is applied, a major constraint on its past use in other western states has been the usual inadequacy of instream flow field studies. Historically, flow recommendations were made for the entire reach below the project to a downstream confluence with an identifiable tributary or a main stem river without investigating the requirements of intermediate stream segments. Little attention was paid to the effects of irrigation diversions or return flows. Likewise, consideration of tributary inflows and groundwater recharge was overlooked in the evaluation of flow needs. These variables are receiving greater attention in contemporary flow studies, although the costs associated with such detailed investigations are significantly greater. They are justifiable where high-value fish and wildlife resources are at stake.

An added constraint in the future will be the costs of the installation and maintenance of streamflow gauges which are necessary to fully implement this strategy. Conversations with the United States Geological Survey indicate that an assumption of gaging costs by a construction agency is determined on a case by case basis. In some instances, the construction agency and the fish and game agency will share these costs; otherwise, either one or the other will assume the total costs. The cost of installing a gage can range from $15,000 to $40,000; approximate annual operation and maintenance costs can be $4,000.

If this strategy is applied in the future in New Mexico, its effectiveness will be enhanced by improved flow study methodologies. The ability to document seasonal instream flow needs for a specific stream reach lends authenticity and credibility to the fish and wildlife agency's bargaining position, thus increasing the likelihood of a flow reservation. On occasion, the ability to quantify the instream contributions of tributary inflows and irrigation return flows could result in a downward adjustment of project releases, thereby preserving water for other beneficial uses.

Sources

1. Behendorf, Bud, Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia, Private Communication, August 1977.
2. Hale, Arthur, Biologist retired, Fish and Wildlife Service, Private Communication, December 1977.
3. Hale, Arthur, "A Review of Fish and Wildlife as Relates to the Fryingpan-Arkansas Project," presented at Workshop on Water and Environment, Pueblo, Colorado, April 22-23, 1972.
4. Kobes, Karl G., Fish and Wildlife Biologist, retired, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.
5. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director-Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.
6. Pacific, Bob, Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

STATE-FEDERAL COMBINED STORAGE AND FLOW REQUESTS

I. Identification

When recommending flow releases from proposed or existing reservoir projects, the Fish and Wildlife Service and New Mexico Department of Game and Fish should base their recommendations in part on information about storage capacity and projected sales of stored water. The strategy thus embraces simultaneous negotiations for downstream flows and surplus storage capacity in the reservoir sufficient to guarantee the flows. The legal basis of this strategy is the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act which provides for consultation between state and Federal fish and game interests and the Federal construction agencies.

II. Application

This strategy is applicable in two situations: when a project is being planned by a Federal construction agency; and when storage space becomes available in either a planned or existing reservoir. The parties to be involved in this strategy are primarily the FWS and the Department of Game and Fish. They would apply this strategy in their dealings with Federal construction and operating agencies over planned and existing reservoir projects. Support for this strategy can be generated from local residents, conservancy districts, sportsmen, and environmental organizations.

Most operating reservoirs in the west contain either unobligated, unutilized or underutilized storage. "Unobligated storage" is reservoir storage which is not contractually obligated to water users although it is bound by legislative intent for particular purposes. "Unutilized storage" is contractually obligated for future or deferred use, whereas "underutilized storage" is currently not in use for a particular purpose although contractually obligated for that purpose. Knowledge of unutilized, unobligated and underutilized storage can lead to its interim or permanent allocation for minimum flow releases to satisfy instream flow needs of fish and wildlife. Even without producing an outright allocation, such knowledge can certainly strengthen the bargaining position of fish and wildlife interests seeking instream flow reservations.

Early in the project planning phase, the construction agencies should be requested to provide the FWS and State fish and game agencies with information regarding reservoir storage capacity and the projected sale or other commitment of storage. With this data, the fish and game agencies should be able to negotiate for the amount of storage available to ensure minimum instream flows below the reservoir.

During project operation, some storage may become available -- i.e., unobligated, unutilized or underutilized. The FWS and the State fish and game agencies should have cultivated a cooperative arrangement with the Federal construction agencies, requiring notification when reservoir storage space becomes available. With this information, fish and game agencies may decide to recommend the allocation of reservoir storage to reinforce instream flow recommendations if the downstream fishery warrants this extra measure of protection.

The costs involved in implementing this strategy could vary dramatically, depending on the level of cooperation between the fish and game agencies and the Federal construction and operating agencies. If cooperative agreements under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act are successfully implemented (see strategy entitled State-Federal Interagency Consultation) then this strategy would not involve substantial costs. If, however, the FWS and the state fish and game agencies are not routinely furnished with information on planned reservoir capacities and anticipated sale of water storage, or information on available storage in existing reservoirs, then significant costs can be incurred in gathering this information.

III. Illustration

Although this strategy has not been implemented in New Mexico, an illustration from Colorado will serve to demonstrate its utility. The Bureau of Reclamation's Dolores Project (McPhee Dam) was authorized in 1968 as part of the Colorado River Storage Project. McPhee Reservoir, which will have a total capacity of about 381,000 acre-feet, will be operated primarily for irrigation, flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, and recreation. In addition, 800 acre-feet have been allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement. At present, the Dolores River is dewatered at many locations due to channelization and mining and agricultural activities. Therefore, the once excellent trout fishery in the Dolores River has been decimated.

When the project was authorized, the BR planned to release only 4 cfs from McPhee Reservoir for fishery purposes. The FWS and Colorado Division of Wildlife did not recommend additional flow releases because to significantly improve the marginal downstream fishery would require substantial releases which the BR probably would not agree to. In the early 1970's the BR decided to redesign the project, switching from a gravity surface-irrigation system to a sprinkler system. This change was made for two reasons: the sprinkler system is more water efficient, and the sprinkler system would reduce the salinity of return flows.

This change in project design released 800 acre-feet of reservoir storage for other purposes. This storage could have been used to irrigate more acreage; however, the Conservancy District sponsoring the project realized the benefits of releasing the unobligated storage to re-establish the trout fishery in the river. The BR then asked the FWS and Colorado Division of Wildlife to study the river to determine the flows needed to re-establish the fishery. Using the sag-tape method, FWS and Colorado Division of Wildlife personnel concluded that 78 cfs was an optimum flow, 50 cfs an adequate flow and 20 cfs a survival flow for trout below the proposed dam. Based on these studies the FWS and Colorado Division of Wildlife recommended that the BR release 50 cfs from McPhee Dam. The BR agreed to release 50 cfs during wet years, and 20 cfs during dry years. The terms dry, wet, and normal were not defined.

It is, of course, premature to judge the effectiveness of the prescribed releases since the project has not yet been built. Given the cooperation of the construction agency, the costs of implementing this strategy are not too great. The major cost involves the personnel time to conduct the streamflow study.

IV. Evaluation

This strategy has not been applied in New Mexico. However, the Colorado example specifically illustrates how reservoir storage capacity which becomes unobligated can be made available to provide releases for the downstream fishery with the cooperation of the construction agency, the local sponsor, and fish and wildlife interests.

The FWS and New Mexico Department of Game and Fish indicated that the lack of interagency cooperation and lack of hydrological and engineering expertise impose the greatest constraints on the past, present and future utility of this strategy. The fish and game agencies consider the construction agencies to be uncooperative when the later are requested to furnish reservoir and dam data. Furthermore, the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish and the FWS lack the necessary engineering and hydrological expertise to analyze this data so as to effectively negotiate for underutilized, unobligated, or unutilized reservoir storage. In New Mexico, the fish and game agencies, believe that administrative reassignment of reservoir storage to fish and wildlife purposes is highly unlikely.

To a great extent, the future effectiveness of this strategy for new projects depends on successfully implementing other strategies, such as achieving interagency coordination under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (see strategy entitled State-Federal Interagency Consultation) and recommending instream flows early in the planning process (see strategy entitled State-Federal Flow Requests Made Early). It is essential that fish and game agencies actively participate in planning reservoir projects and are kept informed periodically about the availability of storage in already authorized and operating reservoirs.

The strategy's greatest potential exists when the local sponsor or entity and/or the construction agency sees the benefits involved in releasing available storage for fishery purposes and brings fishery agencies into the process of planning reservoir releases. In such instances, the costs of implementing this strategy are not particularly great; however, without cooperation among the agencies involved, the costs could be substantial. For example, major cost might be incurred by the fish and wildlife agencies in gathering information which could have been provided by the construction and operating agencies. On the other hand, fish and wildlife interests must justify the economics of allocating any available storage for fish and wildlife purposes.

Sources

1. Enviro Control, Inc., Strategies for Reserving Instream Flows for Fish and Wildlife, Task 1 (b), Unobligated and Unutilized Reservoir Storage at Federally-Controlled Dams, December 1976.
2. Gregg, Ernie, Bureau of Reclamation, Durango, Colorado, Private Communication, November 1977.
3. Helbig, Vern, Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado, Private Communication, November 1977.
4. Kobes, Karl G., Biologist, retired, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.
5. New Mexico Department of Game and Fish letter to Enviro Control, Inc., 24 February 1978 in response to Enviro Control, Inc., letter to New Mexico Department of Game and Fish 14 February 1978.
6. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director-Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.
7. Pacific, Robert D., Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.
8. Smith, Don, Biologist; Colorado Division of Wildlife, Denver, Colorado, Private Communication, November 1977.

ENGINEERING ALTERNATIVES

COORDINATED MULTI-RESERVOIR OPERATIONS

I. Identification

The operations of a multi-reservoir system are regulated through an operations manual which specifies the flows to be released in keeping with the stated purposes of each project. The most common purposes for which multi-reservoir systems are operated are flood control, power production, and irrigation.

Coordinated operations of a multi-reservoir system to sustain or elevate minimum flows would require modification of the operations manual. To accomplish this, authorizing or licensing documents for component projects within the system must be modified to include the necessary releases. Modification of Federal projects may require reauthorization or relicensing proceedings (see strategies entitled Federal Reauthorization of Projects and Federal License and Permit Stipulations). At the minimum, an adjustment of flow releases would entail the preparation of a memorandum of agreement between the operators of the system and the fish and wildlife interests. The legal and administrative basis for this strategy is the agency and interagency regulations and procedures governing those agencies operating reservoir systems. The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act is the interagency mechanism.

II. Application

This strategy would be applied where a fishery or other aquatic resource below a dam within a multi-reservoir system could be rehabilitated or enhanced by coordinated releases from the system. Parties involved in the implementation of this strategy are likely to be the FWS, the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish and the agency or agencies operating the system. In many instances, the system operator will be a single entity, such as the Bureau of Reclamation operating an irrigation project. Where two or more entities such as the Bureau and the Corps would be responsible for project operations, regulation of the system is often mediated using a memorandum of agreement among the agencies involved. Attempts to secure minimum instream flows by balancing system operations would call for drafting a revised memorandum of agreement.

Upon determining stream flows to be insufficient to sustain the fishery below a dam within the reservoir system, the interested fish and wildlife agency must examine the operating characteristics of the system, especially its flow regimes and its storage capacities (see strategy entitled State-Federal Combined Storage and Flow Requests). Field studies would be performed to establish the flow needs for the affected stream reach. Given the system characteristics and the instream flow needs, the fish and wildlife interests could propose to alter the operations manual and memorandum of agreement to ensure the recommended flows.

Conducting system-wide flow studies will incur the principal costs during the implementation of the strategy. Additional costs will result from presenting a convincing case to the operating agen[illegible] toward revising the system operations manual and in reauthorization or relicensing proceedings if these become necessary.

III. Illustration

Because this strategy has not been implemented in New Mexico, an illustration from Idaho is used to demonstrate its utility. Boise River flows are controlled by a system of Federal reservoirs constructed for irrigation, flood control, recreation, and power production. Components of this system are Anderson Ranch Dam on the South Fork of the Boise River, operated by the BR for flood control and power generation; Arrowrock Dam, a BR-operated irrigation project on the main-stem Boise River; and Lucky Peak Dam, 12 miles downstream from Arrowrock Dam, a CE project operated for flood control, irrigation, and recreation. The Corps presently operates the entire system to provide flood protection for the 65-mile reach of agricultural bottomlands between Lucky Peak Dam and the confluence of the Boise River with the Snake River.

Low flow conditions presently occur throughout the lower 65 miles of the Boise River from mid-October until spring when flood control storage is released. Low flows persist during the irrigation season within the lower half of this reach due to agricultural diversions. As a result of low flows and warm, silt-laden irrigation return flows, the lower 34 miles of the Boise River supports rough fish populations as well as catfish and bass. Coordinated flow releases from the Boise River reservoirs could provide year-round instream flows sufficient to rehabilitate this marginal cold water fishery.

Pursuant to the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, Ada and Canyon Counties, which encompass the Boise River flood plain, are now completing an area wide water quality planning study (under Section 208). As part of this study, the Subcommittee on Instream Flows was appointed to investigate the instream flow problem in the lower Boise River. A final recommendation of the Subcommittee was that the reservoir operations manual for the Boise River system be modified to provide a regimen of "premature flood control releases." These would resemble the type of discharges made through the system during the period of flood storage evacuation from January to May. Flows during this period would approach the 250-cfs level at Lucky Peak Dam as contained in the FWS Resource Maintenance Flow Recommendations. Instream flows in this range would improve the cold water fishery habitat downstream from Lucky Peak.

Concurrent with the recommendation from the Ada and Canyon Counties study, the operators of the Boise River system decided to revise the reservoir operations manual. An Interagency Task Force composed of the CE, the BR and the Idaho Department of Water Resources was appointed to perform this task. The recommendation tendered by the Subcommittee on Instream Flows was delivered to the Task Force for consideration in the revised manual. The decision by the Interagency Task Force regarding instream flows will be influenced by three facts:

- Lucky Peak Reservoir contains 111,950 acre-feet of unallocated storage space
- The Corps and Bureau presently use two different volume forecasting techniques in determining flood storage allocation within the system
- Irrigators have an abiding concern in ensuring that allocated irrigation storage space is not lost due to flood control operations.

As pointed out by the Task Force, the solution to the problem of acquiring adequate instream flows in the lower Boise River resides in improving the flood forecasting methods used by the CE and BR, accepting an increased risk of not refilling the reservoir system, and thereby forfeiting irrigation storage, or assigning the unallocated storage space to the Corps for instream flow maintenance. The Corps has recently completed a study which culminated in an improved volume forecasting procedure. Coordination of flood storage releases under this procedure could guarantee needed instream flows below Lucky Peak Dam during the low flow period without running the risk of failing to fill the storage system.

IV. Evaluation

At present there are no opportunities for implementing this strategy in New Mexico, as there are no multi-reservoir systems in the State. If Brantley Reservoir is constructed, however, the series of dam and reservoirs on the Pecos River will probably require formulation of a coordinated operation plan by the CE and BR. At that time the FWS and the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish might implement this strategy.

A past constraint on the applicability of this strategy for flood control and irrigation projects has been the lack of efficient forecasting methods. Under normal operations, spills were made as necessary in anticipation of needed storage space. The development of a reliable forecasting technique would permit coordination of the system so that storage releases could be made gradually instead of discharging large, habitat damaging increments.

Future utilization of this strategy will increase proportionally as the interest in fish and wildlife habitats increases vis-a-vis project purposes such as flood control, irrigation, and power production. Personnel from the Bureau of Reclamation are optimistic over the future effectiveness of this strategy; ironically, fish and wildlife interests are less optimistic, citing construction agency opposition. In addition, there are a number of cost constraints, which will continue to limit the use of this strategy. The fish and game agencies will incur increasing costs for flow studies which increase in complexity and sophistication as entire multi-reservoir systems are analyzed in greater depth. Hydrologic data requirements and required engineering expertise will demand that fish and wildlife interests acquire the analytical skills of the construction agences in addition to their established biological expertise.

Sources

1. Bayha, Keith, Ecologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Collins, Colorado, Private Communication, July 1977.

2. Gowen, Peter, Ada and Canyon County 208 Planning Commission, Private Communication, July 1977.

3. Idaho Department of Water Resources, Boise River Flood Control Management, November 1974.

4. Kobes, Karl G., Fish and Wildlife Biologist, retired, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.

5. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director - Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.

6. Pacific, Bob, Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

7. Statler, Dave, Fish and Wildlife Service, Boise, Idaho, Private Communication, July 1977.

8. Thompson, Vern, Corps of Engineers, Walla Walla, Washington, Private Communication, July 1977.

RESERVOIR SEDIMENT STORAGE RELEASES

I. Identification

Releases of yield from sediment reserve storage for augmenting instream flows involve storage space reassignment by the construction or administering agecny. Sediment reserve storage space is the portion of reservoir capacity assigned to sedimentation during the economic life of the project. After a project is constructed, the total amount of storage capacity assigned to a sediment reserve will not be needed for many years. This storage, then, can be made available on a long-term interim basis for fish and wildlife protection and other beneficial uses. Such a reassignment is an administrative decision and does not necessitate Congressional reauthorization of the project. The legal and administrative basis of this strategy is the construction or operating agency's statutory authority and administrative regulations authorizing discretionary modifications of operating projects.

II. Application

This strategy will be discussed only as it applies to existing reservoirs. Applying it to proposed projects involves interagency coordination in the planning process (see strategies entitled State-Federal Flow Requests Made Early, State-Federal Combined Storage and Flow Requests, and State-Federal Interagency Consultations). The strategy may be formulated when a proposed or existing reservoir contains unused sediment reserve storage in the active reservoir space lying above the elevation of the lowest dam outlet. Such storage is normally preserved or else drawn down for beneficial uses such as recreation, irrigation or water supply in compliance with operating restrictions. Either the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Fish and Wildlife Service, or a conservation group could instigate this strategy if it determines that an available yield from the sediment reserve can rehabilitate or improve the fish and wildlife resources downstream from the existing reservoir. Ultimately, the concerned party must convince the construction or administering agency, such as the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers, to reassign a portion of the unused sediment reserve storage space to fish and wildlife purposes.

Implementation of this strategy involves two basic decision points. After reaching a favorable preliminary determination, the concerned party must decide to solicit the construction or administering agency for action to modify project operation and release some yield from the sediment reserve. Then the agency must decide if the desired modification is feasible and agreeable. Because of the controversy that is often associated with preserving instream flows, the construction or administering agency might seek formal Congressional approval.

The costs of this strategy to fish and wildlife interests are dependent on the detail and availability of information concerning the sediment reserve storage and the fish and wildlife resources downstream from the reservoir. The concerned party will need to know the amount, depletion rate, and current interim uses of the sediment reserve. In addition, the probable effects that increased instream flows, due to a certain yield of the reserve, would have on the fish and wildlife resources would have to be ascertained.

III. Illustration

Although no actual illustration in New Mexico could be identified, an example of a reservoir in Colorado presently suitable to this strategy can be discussed. Completed in 1963, the Bureau of Reclamation's Paonia Project is located on Muddy Creek in west-central Colorado. The stream below Paonia dam supports trout habitat which would improve significantly if added reservoir releases or relatively clear water could be made.

Because of a projected severe sedimentation problem, a substantial portion (44%) of the active storage capacity of Paonia Reservoir was reserved for sediment accumulation. By the end of 50 and 100 years of reservoir operation, the deposition of sediment is estimated to reduce the active reservoir capacity from 18,150 acre-feet to 14,650 and 10,150 acre-feet, respectively. The Upper Colorado Regional Office of the Bureau has stated verbally that the 8,000 acre-feet of sediment reserve storage might be available for interim use.

In fact, the Bureau, in a project planning report, stated that surplus sediment reserve storage space in Paonia Reservoir would be available for flood control and incidental releases to maintain fish life in the stream below the dam. However, it was also stated that the North Fork Conservancy District could use the 8,000 acre-feet of reserved capacity for irrigation or other beneficial uses until it is required by the United States for one or more of the specified purposes. The BR's Upper Colorado Office confirmed that the conservancy district is utilizing this storage.

Neither the FWS nor Colorado Division of Wildlife has attempted to secure increased releases from Paonia Reservoir. However, the proposed Grand Mesa Project, which would require the construction of Electric Mountain Reservoir immediately upstream from Paonia Reservoir, will probably enable both organizations to review the Paonia storage situation. Furthermore, Electric Mountain Reservoir should diminish the sediment deposited in Paonia Reservoir, thus freeing some storage capacity for long-term obligation.

IV. Evaluation

Although this strategy apparently has not been implemented in the past, it does appear to have broad application because most reservoirs, especially the newer ones, contain substantial sediment reserve storage capacity in the active storage space. The strategy's future effectiveness is primarily limited by the ability of Federal, state or private fishery interests to:

- Determine that the available interim yield from sediment reserve storage can significantly improve the associated fish and wildlife resources;

- Convince the construction or administering agency to reassign and release the surplus water storage for fish and wildlife benefits.

The Corps and Bureau frequently apply the surplus sediment reserve on an ad hoc basis to purposes such as irrigation and municipal-industrial water supply. The user for these purposes is not charged for this water. Thus, it is likely that users of this supplemental water would lobby against its reassignment to fish and wildlife protection. Because of this factor and the reluctance of the construction or operating agency to reassign this storage, the FWS and New Mexico Department of Game and Fish personnel are not particularly optimistic over the future effectiveness of this strategy. Probably the yield from sediment reserve storage space would be reassigned to fish and wildlife purposes only where it is currently unutilized and would significantly improve the downstream resources. The FWS indicates that for many reservoirs, sediment reserve storage is already being utilized by irrigators.

Attempting to ensure releases of sediment reserves requires an examination of existing project records and operations. Because FWS and state fish and game agencies' field offices direct their efforts towards proposed projects, implementing this strategy would involve an expenditure or personnel time normally not provided for from funds transferred by construction agencies. This is a major constraint upon the future effectiveness of this strategy. Probably the best opportunity to implement the strategy would arise when an existing project is modified or a planned project would have an impact upon existing reservoir operations.

Sources

1. Enviro Control, Inc., letter to Harvey R. Doerksen, WELUT, February 7, 1977.

2. Enviro Control, Inc., Strategies for Reserving Instream Flows for Fish and Wildlife, Task 1(b): Unobligated and Unutilized Reservoir Storage at Federally-Controlled Dams, December 1976.

3. Garrison, Robert, Fish and Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Salt Lake City, Utah, Private Communication, July 1977.

4. Kobes, Karl G., Fish and Wildlife Biologist, retired, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.

5. Kochman, Edward, Biologist, Colorado Division of Wildlife, Denver, Colorado, Private Communication, July 1977.

6. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director-Services, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, February 1978.

7. Pacific, Bob, Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

8. United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, A Report on Fish and Wildlife Resource in Relation to Paonia (Participating) Project, Colorado River Storage Project, Colorado River Basin, Colorado, December 1957.

9. United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Regional Director, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Memorandum to Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation, Region 4, Salt Lake City (concerning Paonia Project, Colorado -- Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife report supplement), June 14, 1965.

STREAM CHANNELS TO CONVEY STORED WATER

I. Identification

In operating dam and reservoir projects to convey stored water to downstream users, water is either released into the stream and diverted at a point downstream or conveyed directly from the reservoir via a canal or conduit. This strategy is an attempt to have proposed reservoir projects designed without direct conveyance systems at the reservoir so that water can be released into the stream to benefit fish and wildlife, then diverted as far downstream as may be feasible. This strategy can be effectuated through the consultative process stipulated by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA).

II. Application

As provided by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish conduct investigations of sites proposed for reservoir project, then formulate and present recommendations to the construction agencies concerning fish and wildlife preservation or enhancement. If, as part of their investigations, the FWS and state agencies determine that a reservoir conveyance system may damage the downstream fishery or other biotic resources, they might recommend that such a system by modified. They could draw support from local interest groups and users of the resource to give greater force to such a recommendation.

In conducting their project investigations, the FWS and Department of Game Fish are provided with information by the sponsoring agencies. Any information regarding proposed conveyance systems should be sought at the outset because a recommendation to modify or not build a conveyance system must be made early in the planning process. Detailed engineering and planning are involved, and construction agencies permit applicants would resist a change of plans after spending time and money to develop them. Once the construction begins, a sponsoring agency almost assuredly would not stop construction solely on the recommendation of fish and wildlife interests.

III. Illustration

Application of this strategy is being considered for the Gallup-Navajo Indian Water Supply Project in New Mexico and Arizona. In January 1972 Congress directed the BR to begin a feasibility investigation of plans for providing additional municipal and industrial water supply for Gallup, New Mexico. Investigations began in October 1973 with the determination of Gallup's future water needs to the year 2020, comparison with present water supply capability and the establishment of long range requirements. Early investigations determined the San Juan River to represent the most dependable water supply source. In early 1973 the Navajo Tribe indicated interest in joining with Gallup in the planning of a water delivery system from the river. Planning investigations focused on establishing the long range municipal water supply requirements of several Navajo communities including Shiprock, Crownpoint, Window Rock, and Fort Defiance in (Arizona). Feasibility designs are currently in progress for an aqueduct system to deliver water to the Navajo Indian communities and the city of Gallup.

Two alternative aqueduct systems, the Cottonwood Alternative and the San Juan Alternative, are being considered by the BR, which would utilize water stored in the Navajo Reservoir as the water supply source. The San Juan River Alternative was presented during a formal meeting between the FWS and BR in 1975. The FWS recommended, pursuant to National Environmental Quality (NEQ) guidelines, that the natural stream channel be utilized to the greatest extent possible for meeting fish and wildlife needs. The development of the San Juan River Alternative was a cooperative effort between the FWS and the BR. At this meeting the FWS expressed its concern for protecting the fish and wildlife resources in the river basin. The BR, then apparently, responded by presenting the Cottonwood Alternative in order to present a plan in accordance with National Economic Development (NED) guidelines. Utilization of the stream channel apparently would be a fish and wildlife mitigative measure. At this meeting no detailed recommendations were made, because of the preliminary nature of the study. Furthermore, no fish and wildlife data base had been developed, precluding an assessment of the environmental impact of either alternative. The FWS Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report is in progress and is scheduled for completion in October 1978. The draft EIS report and feasibility study are scheduled for completion in February 1979. Feasibility and cost estimates are being determined by the BR office in Denver, Colorado.

The San Juan Alternative includes an aqueduct system which would involve downstream releases from Navajo Reservoir into the San Juan River and diverting water from the River at a point just upstream from the Animas River confluence. The supply would be treated at this location and delivered through a network of pipelines to sixteen delivery points on the Indian reservation and to Gallup. The San Juan Alternative would generally provide for flow releases of 500 cfs, which is equivalent to present flow releases, or greater to meet irrigation and fish and wildlife needs, although minimum flow releases of 300 cfs may be necessitated during drought years.

The Cottonwood Alternative would divert water from Navajo Reservoir through the canal facilities of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project to a regulating reservoir in Cottonwood Arroyo on the Navajo Reservation. The municipal water supply would be treated at a plant to be located at the regulating reservoir and then delivered through a similar network of pipelines as planned for the San Juan Alternative. If the Cottonwood Alternative is selected, the BR expects flow releases to continue at approximately the present magnitude of 500 cfs from Navajo Dam. The primary difference in the alternative plans is that the Cottonwood Alternative would divert water directly from Navajo Reservoir whereas the San Juan Alternative would allow water to flow in the River for about 25 miles before it is diverted. Predictions of significant energy development in the area, however, would threaten the maintenance of flows provided by the Cottonwood Alternative in the future.

Flow releases of 500 cfs from Navajo Dam, presently, support an excellent rainbow and brown trout fishery, as well as the endangered Colorado Squawfish. This high quality fishery extends for approximately 10 miles below Navajo Reservoir; the next 20 miles is a marginal warmwater fishery. The San Juan Alternative is not expected to significantly alter the present aquatic habitat. However, it will ensure maintenance of an excellent fishery down to the diversion point even if energy development occurs. It is uncertain as to whether or not the Animas and La Plata rivers will provide adequate flows below the diversion point to support the present aquatic habitat.

Construction of the selected alternative is scheduled for completion in 1990. There are several variables which greatly impinge upon the final outcome. For a number of years the BR has proposed installing hydroelectric power generators in Navajo Reservoir and Dam, which has encountered environmental law suits and court injunctions. A proposed coal gasification plant, also, will affect the adequacy of the water supply to meet present and projected demand, as well as, the design of the water supply delivery system.

IV. Evaluation

This strategy is being considered for use in New Mexico and it does offer potential for protection of fisheries directly downstream from reservoirs. Several severe constraints, though, must be weighed in judging future effectiveness. Reservoir conveyance systems usually occur as a function of project purpose or engineering necessity. Single-purpose power and municipal supply projects most frequently divert water directly from the reservoir. Most offstream appropriators seek gravity flow delivery by conduit or canal to minimize pumping costs; sound engineering judgment and ordinary cost saving considerations may demand direct conveyance from the reservoir. Since conveyance structures are costly, construction agencies and permit applicants normally would maximize the use of the stream channel, subject to trade-off cost factors such as high energy use to deliver water by pumping instead of gravity. As evidenced in the Gallup-Indian Water Supply Project case, the burden will be on the FWS and the Department of Game and Fish to justify their recommendation from a cost and engineering standpoint, taking the value of the threatened resource into account in a cost/benefit analysis. Although both water conveyance alternatives will provide for instream flows, the Cottonwood Alternative can not guarantee flow releases in the long term. It is uncertain as to whether or not the San Juan Alternative will provide flows beyond the diversion point, but at least there remains assurance that the present cold water fishery will by maintained below Navajo Dam.

Investigating a proposed project and formulating recommendations, pursuant to the FWCA, usually required substantial time and money. To implement this particular strategy may incur significant additional costs in performing detailed studies to defend a recommendation to modify the reservoir conveyance system.

Sources

1. Dewsnup, Richard L., and Dallin W. Jensen, letter to Harvey R. Doerksen WELUT, February 15, 1977.

2. Enviro Control, Inc., letter to Harvey R. Doerksen, WELUT, February 7, 1977.

3. Enviro Control, Inc., Assessment of Effects of Altered Stream Flow in Fish and Wildlife, Task 3, August 1976.

4. Kyburz, Phil, Project Planning Coordinator, Bureau of Reclamation, Amarillo, Texas, Private Communication, April 1978.

5. Olson, Harold F., Assistant Director-Services, New Mexico Department of Fish and Game, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

6. Pacific, Robert D., Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Private Communication, March 1978.

7. United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Gallup-Navajo Indian Water Supply Project, January 1978.

8. United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Memorandum from Acting Regional Director to Chief, Division of Planning Coordination, Engineering and Research Center, Request for Project Name Change, Gallup Project, New Mexico, 20 May 1977.